

*The Subscription to the SOLICITORS' JOURNAL is—Town, 26s.; Country, 23s., with the WEEKLY REPORTER, 25s. Payment in advance includes Double Numbers and Postage.*

*Subscribers can have their Volumes bound at the Office—cloth, 2s. 6d.; half law calf, 4s. 6d.*

*All Letters intended for publication in the "Solicitors' Journal" must be authenticated by the name of the writer, though not necessarily for publication.*

*Where difficulty is experienced in procuring the Journal with regularity in the Provinces, it is requested that application be made direct to the Publisher.*

## The Solicitors' Journal.

LONDON, MARCH 30, 1867.

A POLICY OF INSURANCE is on the verge of those instruments, respecting which general principles of law give way to commercial convenience. On principle, a contract to pay a sum of money, being a *chose in action*, is not assignable; but for the advantage of trade a promissory note or a bill of exchange is assignable, or, as is commonly said, negotiable by indorsement. So in bills of lading, the property in the goods passes to an indorsee. But in order to make the nearest legal approach to an assignment of the sum agreed to be paid to replace the goods if they are lost or destroyed, a power of attorney is necessary. Further, inasmuch as a simple assignment of the benefit of such a contract is not sufficient, even in equity, to give absolute priority over a subsequent assignee, another doctrine is grafted on the law of this assignment. Notice must be given to the party liable to pay, to the end that everything may be done short of doing the very thing required to be done—namely, making a good legal assignment. The consequence, therefore, of the principle, which had its origin in times when the fear of legal oppression, from giving a stranger to a contract the right to sue on it, had more influence than the exigencies of business, is that in addition to the assignment itself of a *chose in action*, unless it be one of the three negotiable kinds, two subsidiary proceedings become necessary. On each of these proceedings, and especially on notice, body of law has grown up, tending to complication, expense, and disappointment in the multitude of unforeseen circumstances, such as bankruptcy, with which transactions become involved. To obviate these inconveniences as regards policies of insurance, the bill introduced by Sir Colman O'Loughlen proposes to make such an instrument assignable at law, and to enable the assignee to sue in his own name for the amount of the policy. The assignment may be made by indorsement or by a separate deed, and may be in the form given in the schedule to the bill. Any defence valid against the assignor is to be valid against the assignee.

It might be objected to these provisions that the party liable to pay, would thus be placed in a relation of legal liability to a person of whom he has no knowledge; but the same argument would apply to a bill or a note. There seems no good reason why the title to the money in a policy of insurance should not follow the title made by endorsement to the instrument, as it does in the case of a bill or note by the like mode. By such means the party liable, and every one else interested, can always ascertain, before payment, who has the right to the money. The difficulty created by the bill springs from the liberty which it would give to assign by a separate deed. Hence it has become necessary to make further provision by a clause in the bill that any payment *bona fide* made to a party who would have been entitled if no assignment had been made, is to be valid against the assignee if the party paying had no notice of the assignment. But ought such a payment to be valid unless, at least, the policy is produced to the party paying? A simpler course would be to put policies on

the same footing as bills of lading, or bills and notes, and to make them transferrable by endorsement only; although it must be admitted that notice for the purpose of ultimate payment, is not so likely to cause embarrassment from conflicting claims as notice for the purpose of completing title by assignment.

A MEETING of the Digest of Law Commission was held on the 20th inst. There were present Lord Cranworth, Lord Westbury, Lord Cairns, Sir James Wilde, Mr. Lowe, Sir W. Page Wood, Sir G. Bowyer, Sir R. Palmer, Sir J. G. Shaw Lefevre, Sir T. Erskine May, Mr. Daniel, Mr. Thring, and Mr. Reilly.

IF THE FOLLOWING paragraph, which we extract from the *Legal Intelligencer*, has the sanction of the individual named, we think it one of the most audacious pieces of chicanery which even he has ever been guilty of. If it has not his sanction, but is the mere invention of the advertisers, it is worth preserving as a specimen of trade "smartness."

### THE NEW BANKRUPT LAW.

Harper & Bros. have in press a work elucidating the mysteries of the Bankrupt Law, written by Edwin James, Esq., of the New York Bar, who was one of the framers of the English Bankruptcy Amendment Act. Mr. James is thoroughly acquainted with the topic, and we doubt not that his book will be an invaluable *vade mecum* to the American practitioner, inasmuch as bankruptcy will now become a most important branch of legal business.

We assure the *Legal Intelligencer*, of whose entire *bona fides* in the matter we have not the slightest doubt, that it has been grossly imposed upon, and that E. James, ex-Q.C., had no more to do with either of the Bankruptcy Acts than he had with the preparation of the American Constitution. Even when in the zenith of his fame he was a mere *nisi prius* advocate, whom no one in his senses would have trusted to advise on the smallest question of title.

A PERSON who, perhaps, desires to follow, however humbly, in the train of the Lambeth, &c., Trade Protection Society\* exists in the person of a man who thinks it no shame to admit that he is himself the embodiment of the "London, Midland Counties, and General Trade Protection Society." The following is a reprint from an evening paper of the report of proceedings at the Wandsworth Police-court on Tuesday last:—

Robert Wilson was brought up on a warrant at Wandsworth Police-court, charged with obtaining the sum of £1 1s. by false representations.

Mr. Mays, solicitor, of the Wandsworth-road defended.

Mr. Frank Tait, of the Upper Richmond-road, Putney, stated that in February last the prisoner called upon him and produced a circular of the "London, Midland Counties, and General Trade Protection Society." He represented that he was employed as an agent of the Society, and solicited him to become a member. Witness consented, and gave him a cheque for £1 1s., which was the subscription. The prisoner took away a form which witness had signed, and said a receipt for the money would be sent to him from the office. Not receiving the receipt, he saw Mr. Kemp, the secretary, at the office in Ironmonger-lane, City, where there were three or four clerks, and found the prisoner was not employed by the society. The witness added that he was not the prosecutor.

Mr. John Kemp was then examined, and stated that he was now the secretary. He was the proprietor and manager of the business represented by the circular. The prisoner had been in his employment, but he had ceased to act for the society since the end of November last.

Mr. Ingham—Who is the society?

Mr. Kemp—It was originated in 1849 by several gentlemen in Wolverhampton, and it afterwards passed from two or three hands into my hands about four or five years ago.

Mr. Ingham—Then you are really the Society?

Mr. Kemp—Yes, sir.

\* 11 Sol. Jour. 119.

Mr. Mayo—Then there are no trustees and committee, in fact, you are the president, chairman, manager, &c.

Mr. Kemp—There was a committee appointed several years ago. I have ceased to call it a society during the present month.

Mr. Ingham (reading the circular)—Why do you use the word our?

Mr. Kemp—It is a common expression.

Mr. Ingham—Then you are like a royal personage. I see the circular refers to district managers, agents, and correspondents. I suppose you are all these gentlemen.

Mr. Kemp—I have agents and correspondents.

Mr. Ingham—Do you suppose that your subscribers would have paid their money had they known the society was in reality John Kemp?

Mr. Kemp—Yes, sir; there are a great many of the subscribers who know it.

Mr. Ingham—Well, I will ask Mr. Tait. Would you have paid the money had you known that all this pompous affair was John Kemp?

Mr. Tait—I should not. I paid the money because I thought it was a society.

Mr. Ingham—I don't think any other human being would. I believe this is a swindle. For any single individual to call himself a society, and obtain money by that is, in my opinion, a fraud, for which he may be indicted. To Mr. Kemp—You deceive the public by this pompous showing of the circular. It is mere nonsense. To the prisoner—You may go.

The prisoner, who when he was first charged said he had a perfect answer to the case, was then released from the dock, and left the court.

It is most desirable that the public should be fully informed of the existence and ramifications of such remarkable "Societies" as Mr. Kemp's and Mr. Croker's, and should be put on their guard lest they should imagine their funds and their interests to be under the charge of a responsible board of directors, while the whole of the society in which they trust consists of but one man. Mr. Kemp is rather late in the day in ceasing to call himself a society now after four or five years, but the change is commendable, though it may be expected to reduce the number of his subscribers.

THE FOLLOWING letter, which lately appeared in the *Mall Gazette*, seems to us to contain so much useful information on a point greatly and generally misunderstood, and which is just now of considerable public interest, that we gladly embrace the opportunity of inserting it entire:—

THE RESPONSIBILITY OF PRIVATE SOLDIERS.\*

Sir,—I have seen some letters in your columns and a variety of leading articles in other papers, and especially in the *Times*, which appear to me to involve an error of a most serious kind upon a legal question which might at any moment be of great importance. It relates to the responsibility of soldiers to the ordinary criminal law for acting against a mob by the orders of their officers. In an article in the *Times* on the question of the employment of volunteers for the suppression of riots it was not only assumed, but I think expressly stated, that a soldier who fired on a crowd by the orders of a superior officer was not personally responsible for the consequences, and it was argued that if the volunteer was to be called upon to serve at all on such occasions he ought to be protected in the same manner.

I apprehend, sir, that the notion that a military order from a superior officer to a private soldier to fire on a mob protects him in so doing is altogether unfounded, and that by the law of this country a private soldier who fires on a mob under the orders of his officer is in precisely the same position as a volunteer or special constable who does so either by the order of a magistrate or on his own responsibility: that is to say, if he kills anyone he is *prima facie* guilty of murder, notwithstanding the command of his superior officer, and can exculpate himself from the guilt of murder only by proving before a jury either that what he did was actually necessary for the preservation of the peace, or at least that he had reasonable grounds for supposing it to be so. The

difference between the volunteer and the soldier is—that if the soldier refuses to fire when lawfully ordered to do so he is liable to be tried and punished by a court-martial, whereas a volunteer would not be. Their responsibility to the civil power if they do so in obedience to an unlawful command is precisely the same. The unlawfulness of the order would be a good defence before a court-martial for a refusal to obey it.\* The difference between the position of the soldier and his fellow-citizens is—that he is under a more stringent obligation than they to obey lawful commands, and that the tribunal which tries him is likely to uphold as lawful commands what a jury might consider unlawful. This is one of the objections to a military life which are inseparable from the existence of a standing army. On the other hand, the responsibility of the private soldier to civil tribunals for acting upon what he falsely supposes to be a lawful order is, generally speaking, no real hardship, for this plain reason. The commands of his superior officers and of the civil magistrate, though in themselves no legal justification for his conduct, are in all common cases conclusive evidence to go to a jury of his having entertained a reasonable belief that it was necessary for him to fire.† If I stop a man running along the street, pursued by a crowd shouting "Stop thief!" I have committed no assault although he may be innocent, for I had reasonable and probable cause to believe him to be a felon, and the soldier who, being ordered out by his regular officers, fires into a mob, is in precisely the same position. This view of the case obviates the monstrous consequences which flow at once from the doctrine that any command by a lawful military superior justifies any act done in compliance with it—a doctrine which would not only enable a private on being commanded by a corporal to shoot down a colonel or the Queen herself without committing murder or treason, but would even render it his legal duty to do so. I will give but one authority upon this subject, but it appears to me an important one because it is taken from a military text-book, "Simmons on Courts-Martial" (5th ed. p. 227, s. 594):—"If death ensues from the fire of a soldier acting under the orders of his superior, the command itself being illegal, such order would be no justification of the deed in the eye of the common law; and the individual who was the instrument of death would with him directing the act by which it was effected be equally guilty of murder." He goes on to say that a military court would accept the order as a justification so long as the breach of law was not "a palpable and evident dereliction of duty and discipline, or a clear and notorious outrage on all law and decorum," but he adds the following remarkable note:—

"On a trial arising out of the Newtownbarry affair at Wexford in July, 1831, before Chief Justice Bushe and Judge Johnstone, the following conversation is reported to have taken place:—

"Sir W. Cox (a grand juror).—My lord, I would wish to ask your lordship one question. If a military body be called out, and if the commander give the order to fire, whether those acting under his command are exempt from the consequences.

"His Lordship.—My opinion is that no subject of the King is bound to obey an illegal order, and if an officer give an illegal order, those who obey him are not in my opinion, exempt.

"Juror.—Then, my lord, is the soldier to be the judge for himself in the case whether he is to obey the order or not?

"His Lordship.—I suppose so.

"Juror.—Then this being so the circumstance will be received below in mitigation.

"His Lordship.—I have nothing to do with that.

"This remark of the learned judge caused much discussion amongst military men, but there appears to be nothing new in the opinion. There can be no doubt of its being the law of England."

Captain Simmons considers that there is "a shade of difference" between military and civil law on this subject, inasmuch as military law recognises the commands of a superior as a justification when, though illegal, they are not palpably and glaringly so. I think that the principle that they are evidence from which a reasonable belief of the

\* We doubt this. We believe the soldier to be in this dilemma—if he disobeys the order he is liable to be shot; if he obeys it, to be hanged.—Ed. S. J.

† This is the true ground.—Ed. S. J.

\* Of course the same remarks apply in even a greater degree to inferior officers obeying the commands of their "Lawful Superiors."—Ed. S. J.

necessity of his act on the part of the private may be properly inferred by a jury shows that the common law and military law are practically the same; but however this may be, Captain Simmons' view of the common law is precisely that which I have stated.—I am, sir, your obedient servant,

J. F. S.

WE ARE SORRY TO SAY that Dr. Lushington, who was to have sat on Thursday at the Admiralty Court, was too unwell to do so, and in consequence of the illness of the learned judge, the Registrar took motions.

THE SUDDEN TERMINATION of the controversy respecting the extradition of Lamirande, leaves the Government to begin as it were *de novo* their negotiations for a mutual arrangement with France of the terms of a fresh Extradition Treaty. There was some reason to hope that on this case of Lamirande, and the proceedings arising out of his abduction from Canada, some common definition of the term forgery would have been arrived at. This hope has, however, not been realized, and the definition of all the crimes named in our treaty with France, remains to be settled by the law of the country where a supposed criminal has found asylum. It will be recollect that Lamirande was a cashier in a bank at Poitiers, who absconded after having embezzled large sums of money. The circumstances of his removal from Canada by the French authorities will be fresh in the recollection of our readers,\* but it is not with the political question, but with the nature of the crime charged, that we have now to do. The means by which Lamirande was enabled to commit the offence charged, was the making false entries in the bank books, which, according to the Penal Code, is forgery. According to our law this is not forgery, as was unanimously decided in the case of Charles Windsor, the clerk in the Mercantile Bank of the City of York, who, by means of fraudulent entries in the bank books, was enabled to abstract from the bank coffers from time to time, large sums of money. In the year 1865 we referred fully to this case of Charles Windsor,† which, as regards the nature of the crime charged, resembles that of Lamirande. The unsettled points in the adjustment of the extradition question are (1st) as to procedure and (2nd) as to the definition of crimes. If the mode of procedure could be settled by mutual concessions it would be for the interest of both contracting parties to an Extradition Treaty that the crimes therein mentioned should be defined, as they now are, by the law of the country of asylum. And this, we apprehend, must remain as a condition of such treaties so long as the whole world is not governed by one sovereign and one set of laws. The intervention of the English Government on his behalf has been declined by Lamirande, and it would be useless to do more than withdraw, as Lord Stanley has done, from the controversy, reserving the question of the soundness of our claims for his extradition.

THERE HAS BEEN, so Mr. Ruter states, introduced into the American Senate a bill, proposing to allow American citizens to sell war vessels to belligerents at peace with the United States. This, it must be admitted, is a somewhat startling proposition, considering how utterly opposed it is to the line taken by the United States Government in the *Alabama* case. If that Government be right in that case, this bill proposes to bring the municipal law of the United States into direct conflict with international law. Had such been the law of England at the time of the late civil war in America, would they have recognised it as an answer to their "Alabama claims"?

#### INFANTICIDE.

The Harveian Society has been studying the subject of infanticide, and the result of their studies has been to conclude to send a deputation to the Home Secretary recommending certain proposed alterations in the law for

the consideration of the Legislature. Recently this deputation waited upon Mr. Walpole with their suggestions, but, after a patient hearing, were informed that a bill, based upon the recommendations of the Capital Punishment Commission, would be introduced this session, but that the Home Secretary could promise them no more legislation beyond that without giving the subject much more consideration. He asked to be furnished with statistics, which the deputation promised should be supplied. This bill has since been brought in.

While we are willing to believe that the statistics collected by the Harveian Society are not, like Dr. Lankester's, founded partly on conjecture, and arriving at conclusions not warranted by the known facts; it is impossible to close one's eyes to the fact that the statistics of infanticide are based only on the number of cases in which the parentage of the child is discovered, and that, therefore, it is almost impossible to say with accuracy that about thirty per cent. of the children who meet with violent deaths are legitimate, and that seventy per cent. are illegitimate. There are, it must be admitted, circumstances connected with the birth of illegitimate children—such as the shame of the female parent, the dread of exposure, the difficulty of finding a nurse for the child so that the mother may be enabled to enter upon some employment—which do bring about the desire to put them out of the way, but it must also be admitted that the first two of these reasons do not, in the majority of cases, come into operation. It is, in most cases, the intolerable burden of the support of the child, and the poverty of the person bound to support it, which is the ultimate cause of infanticide, and it cannot be said that this cause operates more in the case of illegitimate children than in that of the offspring of parents who are married to each other. However, the committee of the Harveian Society have declared their business to be more with the former than with the latter, and if their recommendations should have the effect of producing the chief of the alterations in the law which they suggest, a good work will have been performed.

Their first proposal is that the registration of all births should be compulsory. It may be objected to this that a very large number of births must be registered which would in effect be no births at all (because it is evidently intended that all children born after a certain period of gestation should be considered as being born, and should be registered, according to circumstances, as still-born or otherwise) and that so large a number as there must be would only cumber the register with what is in effect useless information. But this ought not to be an objection. A separate register for still-born children might be provided, if necessary, and preserved as a record to show the absence or presence thereon of any case where foul play might be suspected.

Another recommendation is more difficult to carry out and presents features which raise questions, not only of possibility, but of expediency. It is proposed that the burden of maintaining the child should be divided between the father and mother. At present, in the case of illegitimate children, the great burden falls upon the mother, and the person really sacrificed is the child. It may well be doubted whether the probability that the father of an illegitimate child can be found, in any appreciable proportion of cases, is sufficient to make legislation on the subject worth the trouble, and certainly, unless aided by the adoption of the further recommendation of the society, that the child should have the protection of the Poor Law, and that on it should rest the *onus* of reaching the father, any attempt to divide the burden would be futile. But we would ask in humble simplicity whether the burden of maintaining illegitimate children is not, by the law as it at present exists, divided equally between the father, when he can be found, and the mother? Thousands of children are maintained on a smaller sum than twice two and sixpence weekly, but if that amount is not sufficient, by all means let the maximum payment to be made by the

\* 10 Sol. Jour. 1110, 1122.

† 9 Sol. Jour. 612.

putative father of an illegitimate child be increased to five shillings, as suggested by the society.

The conclusions of the Harveian Society pretend to show that the indirect causes of infanticide are to be found in the overcrowding of the dwellings of the labouring classes; in the custom prevailing in some districts of public hiring of servants; in the gang system; and in the promiscuous lodging of the sexes during hop-picking, &c. It would have been more satisfactory had they also stated its direct causes. These may be briefly summed up in the word poverty. Poverty is the cause of the promiscuous lodging of the sexes; poverty and dirt and promiscuous lodging lead to immorality; this last banishes from the mind much of its natural sense of right and justice, and while it makes its victims harder and more impulsive in their nature, makes them more cunning in escaping detection and less scrupulous in committing crime.

The object then of the Legislature should be to at once cut off this fruitful source of crime, and by shifting the burden of maintenance, in the first instance, upon the Poor Law, to strike at the root of the evil complained of by taking away its chief incentive. It is useless to make a law against the promiscuous lodging of sexes, or against the overcrowding of dwellings, unless, at the same time, means are provided for the poor being lodged in more capacious quarters.

Obviously, therefore, if it be admitted that it is both the duty and the interest of the State to prevent the now enormous sacrifice of infant life—and we think it is so admitted—the recommendation of the society is well calculated to effect the object in view.

A system for the registration of nurses has also been devised by the society. They state that at the present time nurses taking illegitimate children are so incompetent that it is rare for such children to reach maturity. They propose to provide penalties against any taking illegitimate children to nurse who are not duly registered (*quare*, are the children or the nurses to be registered), and to restrict any nurse from taking more than two children; and, in short, to keep up an efficient registration and medical supervision of all wet-nurses and dry-nurses. In a country like our own, where the *domestic virtues are in such repute that every woman is supposed to be capable of acting as a nurse*, the difficulties of carrying out any such system of registration and supervision would be immense, and the expenses such a system would entail on the poor people concerned would in effect deprive many of their livelihood, and so, probably, diminish the number of efficient registered nurses. Although we cannot hope for much success with regard to this proposal, there is no difficulty in perceiving that it contains some elements of usefulness, if only the details can be arranged and afterwards carried out.

Mr. Walpole's reply to the deputation was not very encouraging, but at the same time it may be hoped that the pressing necessity of the case, and the undeniable fact that infanticide is on the increase, may lead to a full consideration of the subject, and that something more may be done with it this session than will result from simply carrying out so much of the recommendations of the Capital Punishment Commission as bears upon this very grievous class of crime.

### RECENT DECISIONS.

#### EQUITY.

##### VARIATION BETWEEN PROSPECTUS AND MEMORANDUM OF ASSOCIATION OF A COMPANY.

*Re The Cachar Company.*—*Lawrence's case*, L.J., 15 W. R. 571.

*Re The Russian (Vysounsky) Ironworks Company.*—*Kincaid's case*, L.J., 15 W. R. 571.

We shortly called attention to these cases last week,\* and we now propose to make a few more detailed obser-

vations upon them, inasmuch as the judgment of Lord Cairns, in the first of them, contains a very clear statement of the principles which his Lordship conceives to be applicable to cases of this kind—a principle which, we believe, he for the first time judicially enunciated in *Wilkinson's case*, 15 W. R. 499, to which case we invited our readers' especial attention three weeks ago.\* It will be remembered that, in *Wilkinson's case*, the company from which that gentleman desired to escape was in process of liquidation, so that the question of the right of creditors directly arose. In each of the principal cases on the contrary the company was a going concern, and this circumstance seems to put in a still more forcible light the strict rule which will probably be in future applied to all cases of this description.

The facts of *Lawrence's case* may be shortly stated thus:—In July, 1865, a prospectus of the Cachar Company was circulated in which it was stated that the company was formed for the purchase of certain specified estates in Cachar, and for their cultivation as tea plantations; from which cultivation, reasoning from the successful results which had attended the operations of other tea companies, the prospectus anticipated very large dividends as likely to accrue to the shareholders. Mr. Lawrence saw this prospectus, and appears to have been very soon seized with the desire of becoming a large shareholder in the company. He had several communications with one of the gentlemen who were mentioned in the prospectus as brokers of the company (a gentleman with whom he had a previous acquaintance), and ultimately, on the 4th September, 1865, he sent in an application in the usual form for 2,000 shares in the company, paying, at the same time, a deposit of ten shillings per share.

The memorandum of association of the company was not registered until the 11th September, 1865. By it, much more extended objects were provided for than those mentioned in the prospectus. On the 7th of October following 2,000 shares were allotted to Mr. Lawrence, and he paid the further sum of ten shillings per share on allotment. From this time until the month of May, 1866, Mr. Lawrence appears to have rested in a wholly passive state with respect to the company. He did not trouble himself to read the memorandum or articles of association; he did not even obtain a copy of those documents, and he was in entire ignorance of their contents. However, on the 10th of May came the celebrated Overend & Gurney panic, and Mr. Lawrence, like many other people, then found that it would be extremely inconvenient to pay calls. About this time his son (the father was a gentleman of very advanced age) seems to have become alarmed at his father's position with respect to this company, there being a liability for future calls of £9 per share, amounting on Mr. Lawrence's shares to £19,000. The son had a number of interviews with the secretary and other officers of the company, in which his chief aim appears to have been to impress upon them his opinion that the company would not succeed, that the shareholders could not pay calls, and that it would be the best plan to wind up the concern. On the 14th of May the son obtained copies of the memorandum and articles of association, and these documents were on the 16th of May placed in the hands of Mr. Lawrence's solicitors. Notwithstanding this, no attempt was made to repudiate the shares until the month of September. On the 25th of September, 1866, notice of a call of £1 per share was sent to Mr. Lawrence, and thereupon his solicitors by his instructions wrote to the company, and stated that he repudiated the position of a shareholder, and that he should at the earliest opportunity apply to the Court to have his name removed from the register of members of the company. This application was accordingly made, and was heard by Vice-Chancellor Wood. His Honour, however, declined to accede to it, upon the ground that the delay from May to September was a bar to the right of relief.

\* 11 Sol. Jour. 479.

\* 11 Sol. Jour. 425.

Upon appeal, this decision was affirmed, both the Lords Justices agreeing with the Vice-Chancellor upon this point. Lord Cairns, however, went much further than this, and held, in accordance with what he said in *Wilkinson's case*, that, even on the 16th May, 1866, when Mr. Lawrence first became acquainted with the contents of the memorandum and articles of association, he had no right to repudiate the shares. His Lordship was of opinion that the variation between the prospectus and the memorandum of association was such as fully to justify the repudiation of shares applied for on the faith of the prospectus, provided that the repudiation was made in proper time. But his Lordship said—"It must, in my opinion, be assumed against any one applying for shares in a company of this kind, not fully formed, that he is aware that no company desiring limited liability can rest on its prospectus, or on any private partnership, contract, or arrangement; that there must be a memorandum expressing the objects of the company, and a register showing to the public who are its members. In this register of members Mr. Lawrence, by the form of his application for shares, expressly authorised his name to be entered, and he must have been aware that, upon this being done, he would be held out to the world as a member of the company, whatever the form or substance of its memorandum or articles. He must be taken, in my opinion, to have known that either the memorandum of association was prepared and accessible at the time of his application, or that it must be prepared forthwith, and that, in either case, both it and the articles must, in their very nature, be documents differing widely in form from, and on all matters of detail, at least, going beyond the prospectus. And with regard to documents of this description, on the mode of framing which consistently with the prospectus so much difference of opinion might well arise, it would, in my opinion, be contrary to the first principles of justice to hold that Mr. Lawrence was at liberty to remain wholly passive, content to trust to what was stated in the prospectus, and while he knew that an authority to register his name, and hold him out as a shareholder, had been given, and probably acted on, to keep himself in a position to ratify all that had been done if the company turned out prosperous; and for the first time to inquire, and, if possible, repudiate, should a financial panic come, or the speculation turn out unsuccessful. Admitting that there existed no memorandum of association which Mr. Lawrence could have seen when he applied for shares, he was, in my opinion, entitled to a reasonable time after the registration of the memorandum, to acquaint himself with, and, if so disposed, to object to, its contents. What would be a reasonable time might in some degree vary in different cases, but would always be measured with reference to the thing to be done, and in this case I am unable to see why, at the time when Mr. Lawrence received his letter of allotment of the 7th of October, 1865, and made his second payment upon it, he should not be held either to have had knowledge of the charter and rules under which the company was about to undertake business, or to have been content to waive any examination into them."

These observations show very distinctly the principle which his Lordship thinks ought to be applied to cases of this description, and they are, as is everything said by him, deserving of the most careful attention. The general principle enunciated is, moreover, one which we think commends itself to every one's natural sense of justice. It might very well be that if no one were concerned in the matter but the promoters of a company, and the unfortunate shareholder who has been deluded into joining in a speculation very different from that which he anticipated, he might be at liberty to assume, without further examination, that the company actually formed was exactly that which he had agreed to join; and that the promoters who circulated the prospectus might be estopped from disputing his right to make this assumption, and his consequent right to repudiate the position and liabilities of a shareholder at any time when he dis-

covered that that assumption was untrue. Lord Cairns observed in the course of the argument of one of the cases, "It is impossible to disentangle the case of the *jus tertii*." How long is a man to be allowed to continue in this passive state of ignorance, while the company on whose register he not only appears, but knows that he appears, is contracting debts upon the faith of the solvency of himself and the other registered shareholders, and, moreover, while he can at any moment, by the payment of one shilling, obtain the means of satisfying himself of the objects of the company as actually registered, and the rules laid down for its management? If this reasoning be sound, we think the only satisfactory answer is that which Lord Cairns gives in his judgment. A man is entitled to a reasonable time after registration of the memorandum and articles to satisfy himself of their contents, and to object to them if he so desire, but if he does not object within reasonable time he must be held to have waived his right to do so. But we think that, in the vast majority of cases at least, the *jus tertii* has really nothing to do with the matter, and that Lord Justice Turner was right when he said in *Ship's case*, that the creditor trusted the corporation only, and not the individuals.

Neither can we exactly follow his Lordship in the observation that the memorandum of association of the company must be a document differing widely in form from and, in all matters of detail at least, going beyond, the prospectus. That of course is strictly true with respect to the articles of association, but it appears to us not to apply to the memorandum, which is necessarily a very short document. And we cannot see that the clause which defines the objects of the company need, even in words, differ from the prospectus.

Of *Kincaid's case* we will only remark this, that both the Lords Justices concurred in holding that a shorter period than in *Laurence's case*, a period, namely, of rather less than three months, after knowledge of the variation complained of, was a bar to relief. In this case also Lord Cairns held, upon the same principle as in the other, that the right to relief was gone long before the actual knowledge of the facts was obtained. Lord Justice Turner, though he agreed in the conclusion in both cases, desired to be understood as giving no opinion how the matter would have stood if there had been no delay after the knowledge of the variation complained of had been acquired; from which it is pretty clear that his Lordship adheres to *Ship's case*, and *Stewart's case*, from which cases we think it is equally clear that Lord Cairns dissent.

There is another passage in the judgment of Lord Cairns which we think is important, as bearing upon a subject on which some remarks appeared last week in the pages of a usually very well informed contemporary, the *Economist*, but which contains a serious mistake as to the requirements of the law with respect to limited companies.

Lord Cairns observes on the general scheme of the Act of 1862:—

"No company can, under that Act, obtain a limit of liability for its shareholders, except by registering a memorandum of association, which is the charter and limit of the powers of the company, just as the articles of association may be said to be its rules of internal government. A copy of these documents is to be forwarded to every member on his request at a fee not exceeding one shilling. When registered they bind the company, and every member of it, as if each member had executed a deed with covenants to the effect of the provisions which they contain. On the other hand the test, and the only test, which other members and the outer world can have of the membership of any particular person, is the entry of the name of that person on the register as a member." And further on—"It is perhaps to be regretted that the Legislature has not prohibited the issuing of a prospectus or the application for shares prior

to the registration of the memorandum of association and the incorporation of the company."

The *Economist* of last Saturday, under the title of "An Easy Safeguard Against the Worst Limited Liability Companies," makes some suggestions for the improvement of the law of limited liability, and these suggestions are prefaced by the following surprising statement:—"The law now requires three documents to be prepared before a company is finally constituted—the prospectus, which is published in the newspapers; the memorandum of association, which is a sort of preliminary code while the company is being formed; and the articles of association, which are the final and binding laws." The real fact of course is that the prospectus is a mere puff, circulated by the promoters of an intended company, in order to induce the public to subscribe the requisite capital, and is no more required by the law as an essential preliminary step to the formation of the company than the kind inquiry addressed to the public, "Do you double up your perambulators," is necessary to enable a manufacturer of those collapsing baby carriages legally to exercise his trade. What the law really does require as essential to the formation of a company with limited liability is the execution by seven persons, and the registration, of a memorandum of association, in the form mentioned in the 8th and 9th sections of the Act of 1862; with this further requisite that, if the company be limited by guarantee, the memorandum of association must be accompanied, when registered, by articles of association. If, however, the company be limited by shares this accompaniment is not necessary; but if there be no accompanying articles, then the management of the company will be regulated by the provisions contained in Table A in the first schedule to the Act. The memorandum when registered is not, as the *Economist* calls it, "a sort of preliminary code while the company is being formed," but, as Lord Cairns puts it, "the charter and limit of the powers of the company;" and the articles of association, or the regulations in Table A (as the case may be), are, as his Lordship also says, "the rules of internal government" of the company.

The *Economist* complains that, "in many hundred cases, if the shareholders had seen not only the advertised prospectus, but the latent memorandum, or subsequent 'articles,' they would never have dreamt of joining the company." This, no doubt, is perfectly true, but if the shareholders have, on the faith of a prospectus, committed themselves to a foolish speculation, they have only themselves to blame. They deserve pity for their folly, as does anyone who commits a weak and foolish act, but they have no more right to blame the law for the consequences of their folly than has a man who buys "bargains" on the faith of an advertisement, and then finds that he has bought rubbish. The old maxim *caveat emptor* is, we think, too often forgotten.

Our contemporary's proposed remedy for the evils which result from the credulity of the investing public appears to us singularly futile. He says—"We propose that these three documents should be printed in the *London Gazette*, and that the projected company be bound to sell copies of them at sixpence, or in bulky cases a shilling." We venture to think that the best remedy of all would be that every intending investor should take care to join no company of which the memorandum and articles of association are not actually registered, and then not without a careful consideration of their contents, and if necessary legal advice thereupon. If further legal protection be required, it would be no doubt most desirable to pass such an enactment as is suggested by Lord Cairns, viz., a prohibition of the publication of a prospectus or the reception of applications for shares until the company is actually incorporated by registration. And, if we may add to his Lordship's suggestion, we think it would also be advisable to provide, that with every allotment of shares there be sent to each allottee a printed copy of the memorandum and articles of association which have been actually registered, and to fix a

short statutory limit within which every allottee must make his objections to the terms of those documents, or be conclusively bound by their contents.

#### COMMON LAW.

*Bryant v. Foot*, Q. B., 15 W. R. 421 (continued).

The Chief Justice and Mellor, J., do not rest their judgment in this case solely upon the authority of the cases decided upon moduses, which, as we noticed the week before last, would be a very unsatisfactory ground upon which to base their decision; but they clearly lay down the doctrine that in deciding whether the title to any such right is established by evidence of user, the Court (being at liberty to draw inferences of fact) ought to consider whether the right has, *as a fact*, been enjoyed since the accession of Richard I. The Chief Justice is reported to have said, after stating the facts of the case and the rules of law relating to prescription:—"The question is whether we are to do violence to our consciences both as judges and as jurymen (for we are judges of fact as well as of law in this case), by holding that this custom dates back to the time of legal memory when we are convinced that such cannot be the case;" and Mellor, J., said "It cannot be doubted that if we are at liberty to enter upon the historical inquiry, and we are not precluded by some arbitrary rule from doing so, that the result must be fatal to the fee or duty claimed." "Common sense revolts at the idea that a fee of such amount could have existed in the time of Richard I., and, under such circumstances, I cannot merely say that I am not satisfied that it existed, but I am compelled to say that I am satisfied that it did not and could not have existed." If this be the correct rule to apply to such cases, if no prescriptive right can be established, except under the Prescription Act, unless it is shown that it is probable as a fact (and not as a fiction of law) that the right has been enjoyed for more than 650 years, it is difficult to see how any such rights can, after this decision, be successfully claimed by the common law prescription. It would be extremely difficult to persuade any one that any right had really been exercised as a fact for so long a time. In the vast majority of cases the evidence against the probability of such length of enjoyment is overwhelming. For instance, suppose a right of fishing claimed over a piece of water in Blackacre, in right of Whiteacre, what evidence of the sort that it is usually possible to adduce in such cases would, under ordinary circumstances, convince any one that it had been exercised since the accession of Richard I.? We have only to reflect on the vast changes that have taken place in the physical aspect of the country, and the numerous political and social disturbances that have occurred at various epochs of our history, in order to be convinced that even the most credulous would find it hard to indulge in a belief which is opposed to all the teachings of experience as exemplified in the constant change of all things perpetually taking place amongst us. Notwithstanding this we find a great number of reported cases in which rights of this sort have been established simply by evidence of long user. The irresistible inference which must be drawn from this is that the law which was applied to those cases was different from that which has been applied to *Bryant v. Foot*. In fact, it seems clear that formerly there was always a strong leaning in favour of rights which had been long and peacefully enjoyed, and user for the period of legal memory was always presumed upon clear evidence of more than twenty years enjoyment being shown, unless it appeared that the right could not by possibility have existed for such a time, as where unity of possession was allowed to defeat the claim to an easement. In one class of cases the Courts went very far in upholding prescriptive rights. They held that the right to light might be gained by twenty years user, although, of course, it could usually be shown that the house for which the light was claimed had been erected but a short time comparatively speaking, before the commencement of

such period of twenty years. No doubt the right to light stands upon a somewhat different footing from most other easements, but still this is an instance of the desire of the Courts not to disturb rights which had been long acquiesced in. In fact, if the Courts had not applied the law of prescription in this way to claims of right to light, it would have been almost impossible ever to establish such rights at all by prescription. It could nearly always be proved that any particular buildings did not exist at some time since A.D. 1189. The judges, however, interpreted the law liberally, and rights to light were frequently established by prescription.

In *Bryant v. Foot* the Court take a somewhat different view of the law, and construe it very strictly, and it would seem, therefore, that this case must be considered as having introduced an alteration in our law, as the decision is not expressly supported by any authority, nor for the reasons above mentioned, by analogy to the cases decided upon moduses, and as the principles laid down in the judgments of the Chief Justice and Mellor, J., can scarcely be considered as entirely in accordance with those upon which so many preceding cases have been decided. This view of the case is moreover in entire accordance with that expressed by Blackburn, J., who dissented entirely from the decision of the other judges and from the grounds upon which that decision was founded. The consequences of this decision are likely to be very important. There are many rights which have long been assented to from the belief that they could, if necessary, be established by a judicial decision which now will, in all probability, be disputed. The objection which was successfully urged against the claim for the customary payment in *Bryant v. Foot* will, apparently, be applicable to all customary payments whatever which now depend for their legality upon prescription. In the words of Blackburn, J., the effect on vested interests "will be very startling, for there can seldom be a payment of sufficient amount to make it worth while to collect in modern times, and yet not so large as to be open to the objection of rankness." Immediately after the judgment in this case was pronounced, judgment was also given in the case of *Lawrence v. Hitch*, which was a claim for a customary due or toll of a shilling for every cart-load of vegetables brought into Cheltenham market. This case was, of course, governed by the principles which had just been enunciated in *Bryant v. Foot*, and judgment was given against the claimant of the toll. So it would seem judgment must now be always given against any claim for any customary payment which is likely to be brought before the courts of law. Even in cases where the claim is not for any money payment this case will be an authority of great importance, and will necessarily tend to make it more difficult than formerly to establish any kind of prescriptive or customary right. If this result were the necessary consequence of the strict application of legal principles, however much we might be inclined to find fault with the law, there would be no reason to be dissatisfied with this judgment. As it is, however, it seems to us that the decision was not the logical consequence of the application of the rules of law which have hitherto been held to govern such cases, and that it is the more to be regretted, as it is likely to disturb many vested interests to a very serious extent. Under all the circumstances it is, of course, not improbable that it may subsequently be brought before a court of error, which may perhaps feel more inclined to adopt the reasoning of Blackburn, J., than that of the other members of the Court. Whether the Court of Exchequer Chamber has or has not to consider this case, and whether the principles of this decision are or are not followed out to their full extent, it is equally desirable that the Legislature should interfere and pass some Act which will apply to all those rights which may now be gained by custom or prescription, and which do not fall within the provisions of the Prescription Act. Most persons will readily admit with the Chief Justice "that a law which requires prescription or custom to be

carried back for a period of nearly 700 years is a bad and mischievous law, and one which is discreditable to us as a civilised and enlightened people." When the Chief Justice of the Queen's Bench thus denounces an important branch of our law as being "bad and mischievous" it is surely time for the Legislature to interfere and remove what is thus declared by one of the highest legal authorities in the land to be a blot upon our jurisprudence and a disgrace to our civilisation.

## COURTS.

### COURT OF CHANCERY.

(Before the MASTER OF THE ROLLS.)

March 23.—*Williams v. Williams*.—This was a petition by a solicitor under the 23 & 24 Vict. c. 127, s. 48, asking for an order declaring him entitled to a charge on certain real estate (which is now the property of the defendant), in respect of certain taxed costs due to the petitioner for recovering the property in the suit. The case was remarkable, inasmuch as the solicitor who recovered the real estate had been the solicitor of the plaintiffs in the suit, and succeeded in obtaining a decree for them, which directed the defendant to give up possession of the estate to them. They did not pay the solicitor's costs, and both plaintiffs died intestate. The defendant was their heir-at-law, and was now in possession of the estate.

Mr. Osborne Morgan appeared for the petitioner.

Mr. J. N. Higgins, for the defendant, argued that the solicitor had not recovered the property for the benefit of the defendant, but had in fact originally deprived him of it; the case, therefore, was not within the statute, and the petition must be dismissed.

His Lordship said the petitioner was clearly entitled to an order such as he asked. The defendant was, by accident, the heir-at-law of the plaintiffs, and that accident alone gave room for the contention that the petitioner was not entitled to the charging order. He must have a declaration that he was entitled to a charge.

(Before Sir W. P. W. Wood.)

March 20.—*The Liverpool Marine Credit Company (Limited) v. Hunter and Others*.—This was a demurrer. The question raised by it was of a singular character. The law of Louisiana (being the old French law) does not recognise a transfer of moveable property unaccompanied by possession. The plaintiffs, who were mortgagees of a British steam vessel called the *Pacific*, had, in order to save the ship from sale, given bonds for the amount which the owner owed at New Orleans to the defendants. This was done, because if the ship had been sold, the rights of the plaintiffs as mortgagees would have been disregarded, and the proceeds of sale have been divided amongst the New Orleans creditors. The *Pacific* returned to England, and the plaintiffs filed their bill against those defendants who are resident in England, to restrain proceedings upon the bonds.

His Honour allowed the demurrer on three grounds—First, because it was open to American creditors, if he granted the injunction, to come in and deprive the defendants, as well as the plaintiffs, of any share in the vessel. Secondly, he considered the application was tardy. An injunction should have been asked for to restrain the defendants from insisting on the bonds given for the release of the ship. Thirdly, if he restrained the defendants from proceeding on the bonds, no British ship would, under such circumstances, be released in New Orleans, for creditors there would know that the bonds given might be practically invalidated by an order of the English court.

Mr. Kay, Q.C. and Mr. Fischer, appeared in support of the bill; and Mr. Giffard, Q.C. Mr. W. M. James, Q.C. and Mr. Robinson appeared for the demurrer.

### COURT OF COMMON COUNCIL.

A court of Common Council was holden on Thursday the 21st, at Guildhall, at which the LORD MAYOR presided.

Mr. H. Gover, the chairman of the Law and Parliamentary Committee, brought up a report from that committee which recommended, among other matters, that, in consequence of the increase of business at the Mayor's Court, the Common Serjeant (Mr. T. Chambers, Q.C.), be

allowed £550. per annum additional salary, for acting as judge in that court, and ceasing to practice therein.

A short discussion took place upon the motion for agreeing to the report, in the course of which it was stated that it had been the practice, in cases of compensation that came before the Lord Mayor's Court, for the railway companies who were interested to pay the assessor a fee of £25 for his services. Several of the most influential members of the court expressed their opinion that it was a most unseemly proceeding that one of the parties to a cause should fee the presiding judge, who would have to direct the jury upon the question at issue.

After some discussion, the motion for agreeing with the committee in their report was agreed to unanimously.

#### SPRING ASSIZES.

##### SOUTH WALES CIRCUIT.

Mr. Justice Keating and the bar of the Welsh Circuit were locked up in the snowdrift at Dowlais last week. About 100 men were employed in clearing the snow, and the learned party had to return to Neath. In opening his charge to the jury at Brecon a day later than the proper time, Mr. Justice Keating said that after he had left Swansea the train was stopped on the road by a deep snow, which baffled every effort made to get through it; indeed, at one time, he feared the train would not be extricated. It was fortunate the law allowed him to postpone the opening of the court a day, and he regretted the inconvenience caused by the delay.

##### HOME CIRCUIT.

##### KINGSTON.

March 28.—The criminal business was concluded yesterday, before Mr. Baron Bramwell, and at the close of the proceedings, late last evening, a scene occurred which is not often exhibited in a court of justice. Two burglars had been convicted and sentenced, one of them to eight years', and the other to ten years', penal servitude. When their sentences had been pronounced, they suddenly, in a fit of fury, attacked the gaolers, and, half-a-dozen policemen jumping into the dock, a terrible conflict ensued between them and the burglars. The latter fought with such fury that it took eight men to subdue them, and during the struggle it may be conceived what a scene the court presented. When the ruffians were overcome,

The learned JUDGE ordered them to be again placed at the bar, and increased their respective sentences by half the periods of penal servitude imposed—that is to say, he sentenced the one who had been sentenced to eight years' penal servitude to twelve, and the other to fifteen. In doing so he observed that he had thought the sentences he had originally imposed might have sufficed, but from what had occurred it was shown that they were hardened, incorrigible offenders, and therefore their sentences were increased. The criminals were then removed from the bar, resisting violently, and hurling at the judge epithets of the vilest abuse.

##### MARKET DRAYTON SESSIONS.

*Reg. v. Eyre.*—In the course of Mr. Stephen's opening of this case,

The Chairman (Sir Baldwin Leighton) said he thought Mr. Stephen had better go on with the facts of the case instead of telling the magistrates what was their duty.

Mr. Stephen was sorry if he had said anything to offend the Court. He had no intention to say anything offensive.

The Chairman thought he had better proceed with his statement of facts, which would shorten the case.

Mr. Stephen said he would be as short as he could, but he could not be short. In superior courts it was the ordinary course to point out to the judges the application of the law to the case under consideration, and he hoped he might be excused for thinking that he was justified in the remarks which he had made.

The Chairman thought perhaps he might act upon the hint that he had given, but he must take his own course.

Mr. Stephen hoped the Court would not think that he had any intention of being disrespectful to the Court.

The Chairman.—Oh no, not at all.

Mr. Stephen went on to quote some remarks of Mr. Eyre with respect to Gordon which, he said, proved express malice on the part of the prisoner.

The Chairman.—You are addressing magistrates, and not a jury. All this is perfectly irrelevant in our minds.

Mr. Stephen (in a tone of surprise).—You think express malice irrelevant?

The Chairman.—Those last observations might be addressed to a jury, but not to magistrates.

Mr. Stephen.—I am not in the habit of addressing to juries, nor to magistrates, anything that I do not think perfectly relevant.

The Chairman.—All this abuse of Mr. Eyre—

Mr. Stephen.—I am not abusing Mr. Eyre.

The Chairman.—I certainly understood the last sentences so.

Mr. Stephen.—What I say is that the use of language of the character of that I have read proves malice. Is that abusing Mr. Eyre?

The Chairman.—It was the tone of voice, and also the words.

Mr. Stephen.—It is rather difficult, sir, exactly to adopt the precise tone of voice which magistrates may consider the most appropriate under the circumstances. I must plead guilty to having felt something on reading that passage which possibly may have infused something unusual into the tones of my voice. I am very sorry for it. It is not easy to speak in a manner to be distinctly heard and understood, and at the same time to discharge one's voice of all expression. Of course I wish to consult the magistrates as to the manner in which I should address them. The learned counsel then proceeded with his observations.

There was an adjournment of ten minutes. When the Court re-assembled,

Mr. Stephen said it had been suggested to him that the Chairman, when he used the word "abuse" in reference to some recent observations, must have been under a misapprehension. There certainly was some extremely strong language used, but it was Mr. Eyre's language respecting Mr. Gordon, not the language of counsel respecting Mr. Eyre.

The Chairman.—I thought it was your language.

Mr. Stephen.—If I said anything of the kind I should consider it most indecent.

The Chairman.—Well, I beg your pardon; I am glad you have put me right.

#### GENERAL CORRESPONDENCE.

##### LORD ST. LEONARD'S TRADES' UNIONS BILL.

Sir,—I have read your able remarks on the above bill, and I am sure there is scarcely any one who will dissent from the views you have expressed. Indeed, considering the tyrannical and exacting character of Trades' Unions as illustrated by the experience of past years, no one can be so absurdly sanguine as to entertain a strong hope that a mere permissive measure will have the least effect in remedying the evils of which these combinations are so prolific a source. Unless some measure is enacted which in certain cases will check with the strong hand of the law the promoters of these combinations, legislation may just as well not be attempted.

I would be very reluctant to suggest anything which, if adopted, would unfairly restrain the exercise of the rights of British subjects. But it seems to me that some of the proceedings of Trades' Unions may very properly be brought within the province of the criminal law. Technically, as the law stands, it is, I suppose, impossible to bring even the most outrageous measures of Trades' Unions within the definition of a conspiracy; but is it impossible to change the law on this subject in such a way that it would include most of the unwarranted measures generally adopted preliminary to and during strikes, and yet not affect other combinations which are legitimate *in foro conscientiae* as well as in accordance with the law of the land. I think that there would be, according to the doctrine laid down by writers who discuss the philosophy of law, quite sufficient to justify such a measure. The considerations by which they justify those restraints on men's liberty which are imposed on them in every state where anything like a code of laws exists, is that such restraints are necessary to the enjoyment of their rights and liberties by others. In fact, it seems somewhat identical with the English common law maxim—*sic utere tuo ut alienum non laedas*. Now, if we apply one or both of these principles to Trades' Unions, it seems to me that they would justify a legislative curtailment of their liberties or rights, not as British subjects, but as members of societies

and bodies which, as the law stands, are permitted to do things which are generally detrimental to the community. And what makes the case stronger against them is that, while exercising a pernicious public influence, they inflict an incalculable amount of injury on numerous individuals.

If the effect of a strike were confined to employers and employed, it would not be so pregnant with mischief as it invariably is. But its effect must be looked to, both as regards the interests of workmen and their employers in their mutual relations, and also in regard to its operation on the interests of the public. Now, as regards employers and employed, I think it requires no very deep consideration to show that, whatever apparent benefit it may result in to the latter, it is scarcely worth the sacrifice which is made for it. But how, it will be asked, does the result operate on the public? It is clearly proved that the effect of a strike in any department of labour is to raise the price of the thing, whatever it is, in the production or manufacture of which the wages have been increased by means of a strike; for the employers must try and save themselves from being out of pocket in consequence of being compelled to accede to the demands of the Trade's Union; and the obvious way in which to do this is by a preconcerted and simultaneous rise in the price of that thing by the employer. And thus it can be seen that instead of the measures of Trades' Unions being directed against employers, they are in most cases virtually directed against the public. Take for example bakers. The result of a strike among them would be to compel master bakers to raise the price of bread.<sup>†</sup> And see against what portion of the community is the strike virtually directed. If the commodity be a thing which, like bread, is in general demand, of course the burthen falls on the public at large, but it will be most felt by the poor, who must pay as much for bread as they who can better afford it.

Now, I think these considerations will show that a coercive measure against Trades' Unions would be neither unjust nor impolitic. One cannot help thinking, when on this subject, of the strike of the shipwrights some months back, when the Union actually refused seven shillings per day, or a *quantum meruit* salary at the rate of £109 per annum! I think it pretty clear that such demands as those can emanate from no proper or commendable spirit, but only from a spirit of injustice and oppression which, it seems to me, ought to be curbed by the arm of the criminal law.

#### PUBLICUS.

P.S.—To be sure, in a good many cases the result of raising the wages would not lean so particularly on the poor as in the case of bread, or such commodity; but even in such cases it is well known that the effect in several instances of the measures of Trades' Unions has been to compel contractors to obtain what they require from foreign markets.

[We do not think the question whether the result of the strike affects the poor or not, material. The true point seems to us to lie in a nutshell, but, unfortunately, the nut is a very hard one to crack. The problem is, how to leave full liberty to all workmen and others who please to combine for any lawful object (one of which is to regulate the price of *their own labour*), and yet deprive them altogether of any power to coerce others to join in the combination who may not desire to do so—in other words, how to leave union men free to combine together, and yet prevent them from exercising any influence upon or against non-union men. We should be glad to be able to look forward to a satisfactory solution.—ED. S. J.]

#### OUR INVADERS—COMBINING THE OFFICES OF BARRISTER AND ATTORNEY.

Sir,—I gather from the letter of "Advocatus," and your remarks thereon, that a barrister may, with strict propriety, act professionally, without being instructed by an attorney, in the following cases, viz.:—

1. In defending a prisoner.
2. In drawing a will.
3. In drawing any other document which will not require

\* Query "successful." But this does not seem a valid objection; for the public can have no right to a cheap supply at the expense of the workmen any more than at that of the employers.—ED. S. J.

† Does "Publicus" think that the price of bread ought to be kept down by compelling the journeyman bakers to work for long hours and short wages? And if not, may they strike to compel an amendment of the system? And if not, by what means is such amendment to be brought about?—ED. S. J.

the use of the services of a law stationer or of any other person than the barrister himself.\*

4. Advising on any matter of a non-litigious nature.

I would feel very much obliged if you would kindly explain what you mean by the third case above mentioned, for I do not quite understand it. What sort of instruments generally would require the intervention of law stationers and others besides the barrister himself?

I looked into Phillimore's "Private Law among the Romans," but I could nowhere find that passage relating to the case in the Queen's Bench to which you have referred. I have, however, found a passage in that book (in the preface) in which the author has expressed himself strongly against the present usage. After assailing the bar of England with the greatest acrimony, and stigmatising the modern barrister as, in the words of Cicero, "*nil nisi legibus quidam cautus et acutus, praece actionum, cantor formularum, et aucte syllabarum*," he goes on to say:—"This state of things will last so long as attorneys are allowed to possess the exorbitant power they now enjoy, instead of being subordinate to a class superior (or that society assumes to be superior) to them in education, are allowed to hold it in a state of comparative dependence, and a service that certainly is not perfect freedom. No stronger proof of their influence can be given than the fact that they actually threatened to ruin Mr. Brougham if he persevered in bringing forward his scheme of law reform. Mr. Brougham, indeed, said publicly, in answer to that threat, that if it was executed he would sit in his chambers and take briefs without them. But though Mr. Brougham, then in the zenith of his reputation, and the leader of a great party in the House of Commons, was beyond the reach of that body, such is not the condition common *οἰκουμενικοῖς βρετανοῖς*, who tread the rugged paths of professional life."

A gentleman who was examined before the Inns of Court Commission some years past has expressed himself pretty much in the same vein. Indeed, one of them seems to have been inspired by the other. The passage containing the last named opinion is to be found in Mr. Samuel Warren's Introduction to Law Studies, vol. I, p. 106. I will give the passage, together with the criticism of Mr. Warren on it, which, I am glad to perceive, is most favourable to the body so unjustly assailed:—

"The great evil that our profession has to struggle against is and has been the narrowing and illiberal tendency which must be the result where men look for encouragement and reputation to persons of inferior education, not likely to encourage qualities they do not understand, and cannot appreciate; an evil this to which Lord Bacon refers when he says, '*the rewards of learning are in the hands of the unlearned*'. The more we can correct that the better, and diminish the overwhelming and malignant influence of attorneys on our branch of the profession."

Mr. Warren's criticism is in the following words:—

"This sweeping and scornful censure of a vast body of practitioners, upwards of ten thousand in England and Wales alone, and whose influence pervades, and ever will pervade, society in all its ramifications, is to be regretted, for it cannot be justified. It would be ridiculous to deny that their ranks contain men of as nice a sense of honour, and as liberal accomplishments, as can be found, with fewer exceptions, perhaps, than may complacently be taken for granted, among the members of the higher branch of the profession."

For my own part I think with "Advocatus" that a fusion of the functions of barrister and attorney would be most inconvenient; yet there is some truth in the remark that the present state of things renders a barrister very dependent, particularly during the time when he has to struggle hardest in his profession.

NEUTRAL.

[We cannot at this moment verify our quotation, but we perfectly recollect the case, and believe it is to be found somewhere in Mr. Phillimore's book. It will be seen that we do not in the least recommend the practice. On the contrary, we are fully convinced that the position of the bar, particularly the struggling portion thereof, is better and more independent here than in those countries where the distinction in question does not exist, and where, therefore, no one has any reasonable chance of success who cannot get into some good established firm.

\* Ex. gr.—If a deed required engrossment it would be *infra dig.* for counsel to ingress it himself, unprofessional to employ another to do so.—ED. S. J.

But the fact that Lord Brougham could with impunity utter the threat that Mr. Phillimore mentions, and that the solicitors gave way in consequence, proves that it was felt to be allowable to carry it into effect.—*Ed. S. J.*

#### STAMPS ON ARTICLES.

Sir,—Can you inform me whether the stamp duty payable upon "Articles of Clerks" must be so paid at the commencement of the term of service or whether there has not been some recent arrangement made under which the duty may be paid either wholly or in part at the expiration of the term? by so doing you would oblige  
"A SUBSCRIBER."

#### CHIEF CLERKS IN EQUITY.

Sir,—I have noticed with regret that a writer in your journal has for some time past made a dead set against the chief clerks in Equity and the powers exercised by them at chambers. The paper in to-day's journal headed "Martial Equity" has caused me not only regret but surprise. The writer says—"The presiding deity (meaning the chief clerk) will resent the slightest doubt as to his own infallibility, or the most distant hint of a desire to have the opinion of a vice-chancellor." This passage convinces me of what I had long suspected, viz.—that the author of the attacks on the chief clerks knows nothing whatever about chamber practice, and that there is some special reason—of which, of course, I am not aware—prompting him to make these attacks.

Now, sir, I have had years' experience before the chief clerks, and have had business of every description before them all, and, basing my statements on my experience, I say—

1. Every chief clerk is not only a most courteous gentleman but a good lawyer, and is anxious to hear all that can be said. If anything, he is too slow to exercise the powers which it would be beneficial to everybody he should exercise, and too often sends matters before the judge which he could do as well himself.

2. It is felt by both solicitors and suitors to be a great saving of time and expense to get the chief clerk's opinion instead of going to the Court, and instead of the chief clerk resenting a wish to have the judge's opinion on any question in a suit, if only on a summons for time, the solicitor or clerk has only to say that he wishes it and it is adjourned to the judge as a matter of course without the slightest show of feeling.\*

I don't write this to curry favour with the chief clerks, as they can do me neither good nor harm, I merely wish to do justice to a respectable body of men, and to state what I know to be facts, and what I am satisfied will be endorsed by every member of the profession who has had much practice at chambers.

I may add, from my own experience, that I have often, even under the advice of a junior counsel, differed from a chief clerk, and have been listened to with courtesy, and been invited to take the opinion of a judge: I may also add that, although I have taken in counsel to support his opinion, the judge has made no alteration in the order; hence I felt bound to infer that the chief clerk was right after all.†

I am sure that in accordance with your uniform fairness you will insert this in your next week's number, and if the author of "Martial Equity" wishes to have proper and correct notions of the chief clerks' duties and the way they perform them, I shall be delighted if he will for one week attend with me in my ordinary chancery business at chambers, as I feel satisfied that after that he will insert a recantation of his views in your journal of the following week.

G. W. GREENWOOD.

[We have not the slightest doubt that the chief clerks are (probably universally, certainly as a rule) "courteous gentlemen," and so far as may be, "good lawyers," but we are not the less convinced that (and not without the concurrence of high authority) they are gradually assuming judicial functions never intended to be conferred upon them, functions greater than any exercised by the masters in Chancery (whose place, however, they were never intended to fill) and such as not even the Vice-Chancellors ought to exercise

in a closed court. The system which we have lately heard commonly spoken of as the "Cadi" system, whether administered by Vice-Chancellors or chief clerks, is most objectionable, and we shall certainly labour to our utmost to put it down. But we entirely disclaim any intended disrespect to any existing judge of either rank.—*Ed. S. J.*]

#### PROCEEDINGS AT AUCTIONS.

Sir,—To have surprised one of your readers affords me infinite satisfaction. I trust that the following will be equally successful in its effect.

Not only do these commission agents do all that I have before said,\* but they will bring to the sale material of the very worst kind—feathers of the worst description—which, when a mattress is brought forward, is thrown out by them (of course unperceived), as if it belonged to the article put up for sale. They aid the deception with many exclamations upon the inferiority of the feathers, &c., and succeed in getting the article at a reduced price. This is frequently prevented by some auctioneers, and with some others the robbers are afraid to do it, knowing what the result would be, but I am credibly informed that this is a common practice.

R. T.

#### COMMON LAW JUDGES.

Sir,—My last letter has been replied to by "Lex" in the columns of your number of March 16th, and at great length, which I will not imitate. His complaint of want of courtesy on my part, comes oddly from one who says I have had "a touch of apoplexy," and that my argument "savour of apoplexy;" and that my letter shows an "increase of incoherence and vacuity." I dare say it was my fault that I did not altogether appreciate his meaning, and that I do not now. I therefore leave to the judgment of your readers whether he is, or I am, right, and beg to decline further controversy with so sensitive and polite an adversary.

Having thus disposed of (as I believe) the only opponent I have met with in your pages, I will add that I think a great deal too much is said about the number of remanents in  *nisi prius* cases. They arise in term time almost invariably, because special juries are not then taken, but it is not at all fair to treat them as if they were arraids of work—they are no such thing—as well might a chancery cause be termed an arraif if the subpoena to hear judgment is not returnable. I observe a bill is introduced into the House of Lords to transfer some of the Chamber business to the Masters—why they have not already transacted it remains to be discovered. The bill regarding the additional judges of the Divorce and Admiralty Courts seems an indirect and clumsy remedy.

A MANAGING CLERK.

#### THE CHARGE FOR DRAWING.

Sir,—Having for many years had extensive experience in settling bills of costs, and having collected most works on the subject, we venture to reply to your correspondent in your last number.

We find no authority justifying a charge at per skin unless the skin contains fifteen folios. In the latter end of last century the then Lord Chancellor and Master of the Rolls sanctioned *inter alia* the following charge: "For drawing and copy of each skin of 15 folios, containing 72 words per folio, £1." "For perusing drafts of deeds; each skin, 5s." "For examining the engrossment with the draft, every three skins, 10s." These regulations do not appear to have been altered since. So that for drawing a deed of 32 folios, or of say 44, the charge should be 32s. and 45s. respectively, while for perusal or for examining the engrossment with the draft, there would be the same charge in each case, namely, as for three skins. The practice in the two latter cases of charging per skin, has probably led to the adoption of a similar mode of charging for drawing, when the number of folios is of course omitted. The Government requiring the stamp on the third skin in such cases is no reason why the taxing officer should allow it as a whole skin to the solicitor.

KAIN, SPARROW, WITT, & CO.

#### INTERMEDIATE EXAMINATION.

Sir,—I was articled on 17th November, 1865. Will you, or any of your correspondents, inform me the earliest time I can go up for the above examination?

A. E.

\* This is probably the general rule, but we know of several instances to the contrary.—*Ed. S. J.*

† We should not necessarily draw that conclusion.—*Ed. S. J.*

## SALE OF LAND BY AUCTION BILL.

Sir.—The opposition called forth to this bill by the publicity of its clauses and the objections thereto has been such as to cause the promoters to consent to its re-construction. At an interview with Mr. Selwyn, M.P., who has charge of the bill, the matter was satisfactorily arranged as the following letter will show.

FREDK. T. GALSWORTHY.

11, Waterloo-place, March 26.

"Sir.—Referring to the interview we have had with you this morning (on the introduction of the Hon. Locke King) when we showed you the petition signed by the whole of the London auctioneers against the bill, and having heard the views you were pleased to express as to the proposed alterations, and having gone through the several clauses with you as amended, we beg to state, on behalf of the general body of auctioneers, that such a bill, as amended, will be a very useful measure, and that, instead of presenting our petition against the bill, we will on the contrary present a petition in its favour.

F. J. CLARK,  
(Farebrother, Clark, & Co.)

"F. T. GALSWORTHY.

(Chinnock, Galsworth, & Chinnock)  
"C. J. Selwyn, Esq., Q.C., M.P., 37, Euston-square, March 25."

## BILL OF DISCOVERY—COSTS.

Sir.—Will some of your readers, able to speak from experience, be so obliging as to inform me, in your columns, the probable expense of a bill of discovery—first, in the County Court, under the Equitable Jurisdiction Act; and, secondly, in the Chancery of Lancashire. I should like also to be informed the probable amount of costs of each party to the suit, and whether or not the practice is for each party to pay his own costs. In the case before me there are three or four executors from whom certain information is required, but only one of them can, I think, give it. You would assist me very much by referring me to any works bearing upon the law and practice of discovery.

B. D.

## APPOINTMENTS.

The Right Hon. ABRAHAM BREWSTER to be Lord Chancellor of Ireland, *vice* Lord Chancellor Blackburne, re-signed.

JONATHAN CHRISTIAN, Esq., one of the Judges of the Court of Common Pleas in Ireland, to be Lord Justice of Appeal in Chancery, *vice* Mr. Brewster.

The Right Hon. MICHAEL MORRIS, Attorney-General for Ireland, to be a puisne Judge of the Court of Common Pleas, *vice* Mr. Justice Christian.

HEDGES EYRE CHATTERTON, Esq., Solicitor-General for Ireland, to be Attorney-General, *vice* Mr. Morris.

ROBERT A. WARREN, Esq., Q.C., to be Solicitor-General, *vice* Mr. Chatterton.

JOHN PERRY GODFREY, South-square, Gray's-inn, Gent., to be a London Commissioner for administering oaths in Common Law.

THOMAS KENNEDY LOWRY, Esq., Q.C., of the Irish bar, to be one of the Colonial Judges in Jamaica. Mr. Lowry was called to the bar in 1835, and became a Queen's Counsel in 1860.

## PARLIAMENT AND LEGISLATION.

## HOUSE OF LORDS.

Friday, March 22.

## TRADES' UNION BILL.

The report of amendments in this bill were brought up and received.

Monday, March 25.

## METROPOLITAN POOR BILL.

The Earl of Devon moved the third reading of this bill. He said that on a former occasion some remarks had been made by a noble lord (Earl of SHAFESBURY) with reference to the authority under which persons of unsound mind were detained in workhouses; and he read a letter which

conveyed an assurance that the best means of solving the question involved should be duly considered.

After a few words from the Earl of SHAFESBURY the bill was read a third time and passed.

## THE JUDGES IN CHAMBERS.

The Lord CHANCELLOR laid on the table a bill to relieve the judges of a portion of the business in chambers. The noble and learned lord said that the principle part of the practice of the superior courts was transacted in chambers, and a great portion of these duties might just as well be performed by the masters of the courts. Last session, when the salaries of the masters were increased, he caused a letter to be written to them, informing them that a proposal would be made that additional duties of this kind should be imposed upon them, and giving them to understand that no additional remuneration would be granted on that account. Some one judge at present was obliged to rise at 1 o'clock, in order to attend chambers, and thus half the day was lost. He proposed that the judges should have the power of making rules and regulations for the purpose of transferring to the masters such of the business of chambers as they might think desirable. The noble and learned lord concluded by moving the first reading of the bill.

Lord CRANWORTH thought that the measure would be very useful.

The bill was then read a first time.

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Tuesday, March 26.

## ROYAL COURT, JERSEY.

In reply to Mr. LOCKE, Mr. WALPOLE stated that he had no intention of bringing in a bill to reform the Royal Court of Jersey.

Wednesday, March 27.

## CRIMINAL LAW BILL.

The consideration of this bill in committee was resumed at clause 5.

The clause was agreed to, as were also clauses 6 to 8.

The RECORDER proposed a new clause, giving judges a discretionary power of allowing the expenses of the prosecutor and his witnesses in all cases of misdemeanour except those of a local or personal nature.

Mr. CHILDERS pointed out that the House, before sanctioning this measure, ought to have an estimate of the expenditure which it would involve, and this, he apprehended, would be considerable. In the Jamaica prosecution, for example, the whole of the costs would be saddled upon the public, although the parties were undoubtedly in a position to bear their own costs.

Mr. HUNT suggested that the Recorder should specify the particular cases in which expenses might be allowed.

The RECORDER thought it better to leave the matter to the discretion of the judges, reserving only cases of a local or personal nature, the expenses of which ought to be defrayed out of local or individual funds.

Mr. BARROW thought that misdemeanours under the Game Laws ought to be excepted, and that persons who chose to preserve game should themselves bear the costs of proceedings to which they might have recourse.

Mr. HURST thought the expenses should not be allowed in proceedings under the Local Government Act.

The clause was subsequently withdrawn, as was also one proposed by Mr. R. GURNEY for giving power to justices to allow costs to witnesses for the defence.

Some clauses having been added, the bill passed through Committee.

Thursday, March 28.

## THE NEW LAW COURTS.

Mr. LANTON asked the Secretary to the Treasury whether it was the intention of the Commissioners of the Law Courts to accede to the request of the competing architects to the effect that two professional men, selected by the competitors, be added to the judges.

Mr. HUNT replied that the Government had come to the conclusion that it was too late to alter the arrangement in the matter which had been already made.

## Pending Measures of Legislation.

## JUDGES' CHAMBERS (DESPATCH OF BUSINESS) BILL.

A bill intituled an Act to provide for the better despatch

of business in the chambers of the judges of the superior courts of common law.

Whereas a great part of the business in the chambers of the judges of the three Superior Courts of common law at Westminster, might, with advantage to the public, be disposed of by the masters of the said courts:

Be it enacted, by the Queen's most excellent Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Lords spiritual and temporal, and Commons, in this present Parliament assembled, and by the authority of the same, as follows:—

1. *A majority of judges may make rules empowering the masters to transact business in chambers.*—It shall be lawful for a majority of all the judges of the said courts, which majority shall include the two Chief Justices or one of the Chief Justices and the Chief Baron, from time to time to make and publish general rules for the following purposes, that is to say:—

- (1.) For empowering the masters of the said courts, or some one or more of them, to do any such thing, and to transact any such business, and to exercise any such authority and jurisdiction in respect of the same, as by virtue of any statute or custom, or by the rules and practice of the said courts or any of them respectively, are now done, transacted, or exercised by a judge of the said courts sitting at chambers, and as shall be specified in any such rule :
- (2.) For regulating the attendance of the said masters at chambers, the course of practice to be there pursued, and the scale of costs to be there adopted :
- (3.) For fixing, with the sanction of the Lords Commissioners of her Majesty's Treasury, the table of fees to be taken in respect of business to be transacted before the said masters at chambers, and for abolishing or altering from time to time (with the like sanction) such table of fees.

2. *Rules to be read in open court—Copy to be sent to the Lord Chancellor and to be published in the London Gazette.*—Every rule to be made under this Act shall be read aloud in open court in each of the said courts ten clear days at least before the day fixed for such rule coming into operation, and within one month after that day a copy of every such rule shall be transmitted by the Lord Chief Justice of England to the Lord High Chancellor and shall also be published in the *London Gazette*.

3. *Rules to be laid before Parliament.*—Every rule to be made under this Act shall be laid before both Houses of Parliament within one month after the making thereof if Parliament be then sitting, or, if Parliament be not then sitting, within one month after the commencement of the next session of Parliament.

#### IRELAND.

The latest report from Dublin respecting the health of Mr. Blackburn states that he is progressing towards recovery.

#### COURT OF COMMON PLEAS.

By the elevation of Mr. Morris, M.P. for Galway, to the seat hitherto occupied by Mr. Justice Christian (now Lord Justice of Appeal) in this court, that bench is occupied by four Roman Catholic Judges. This is the first time since the revolution that a court has been so constituted and it is remarkable that it should have taken place under a Conservative Government. This step however, is by no means likely to give rise to any dissatisfaction. The three members of the court who sat with Mr. Justice Christian, have shown that with them, religion has no influence on the impartial administration of justice. The legal acumen and intellectual grasp of Chief Justice Monahan are well known. Mr. Justice O'Hagan is as distinguished for high literary culture as for his conspicuous forensic ability, and though Mr. Justice Keogh is best known as an extreme politician whose conduct as member for Athlone we desire to forget; yet since his elevation to the bench, and particularly recently while presiding at the trial of Fenian prisoners, he has shown unexpected judicial power and impartiality to the great satisfaction of men of all shades of political theory and religious belief. That Mr. Morris's elevation will be a source of gratification to the vast majority of the people of Ireland, both Roman Catholic and Protestant, there is no doubt, for the learned gentleman has always been a favourite in his profession and is connected with one of the oldest families in the country.

#### THE ELECTIONS.

Arrangements have already been made for filling up the vacancies caused by the changes consequent on the elevation of Mr. Brewster to the Lord Chancellorship of Ireland. Mr. George Morris, brother of the new Justice of the common Pleas, will address the electors of the borough of Galway. The hon. gentleman is most popular in the borough, with which he connected by family and other important ties, and is no doubt of his succeeding to the vacant seat. The writ directing the election of a representative for the University of Dublin, in room of Hedges Eyre Chatterton, Esq., who has accepted office as her Majesty's Attorney-General for Ireland, was received yesterday. The election is fixed to take place on Saturday morning next. Mr. Chatterton, in his address to his constituents, says:—"My promotion to the office of Attorney-General having vacated my seat in Parliament, I again solicit from you the honour of being returned as your representative. So short a time has passed since my election that it is unnecessary for me to say more than to express the hope that nothing has occurred in the interval to lessen the confidence you then reposed in me." No opposition is likely to be offered to the Attorney-General's return.

#### FOREIGN TRIBUNALS & JURISPRUDENCE.

##### FRANCE.

In the Corps Legislatif, on Thursday, the bill for the abolition of imprisonment for debt was carried by a majority of forty-four.

##### AMERICA.

##### SALE OF CONFISCATED PROPERTY.

Judge Thomas, district judge in Virginia, has decided that the law of congress passed during the war, authorising the sale of property belonging to rebels, is unconstitutional. The case with reference to which this decision was made will at once be taken before the Supreme Court of the United States, and if the decision should be sustained there, it will affect immense quantities of real estate which have been purchased under the law in question. Great excitement on the subject exists in the South.

##### STARTLING SENTENCES.

Judge Russel occasionally startles the town into a sensation by his judgments upon criminals. Some years since he raised a great commotion and put "garrotting" out of fashion by sentencing a practitioner of that unpleasant game, who throttled a citizen and robbed him of six cents, to forty years' imprisonment in Sing Sing. Wednesday another astounding judgment fell from the judicial lips. A fellow was convicted in the Court of Sessions of the despicable offence of impersonating a detective, and black-mailing an unsophisticated officer of the navy. Judge Russel disposed of the criminal by imposing upon him a fine of ten thousand dollars and an imprisonment of two years, or until such time as the fine be paid. As the blackmailer is said to be in a shocking state of impecuniosity, he is likely to be a jail-bird for the rest of his life, unless some soft-hearted governor shall pardon him, which is not at all unlikely, as was done in the case of the forty-year prisoner.—*New York Times*.

#### SOCIETIES AND INSTITUTIONS.

##### THE LAW STUDENTS' DEBATING SOCIETY.

At the Law Institution on Tuesday evening last, Mr. Kenrick in the chair, the question discussed was—"Is the operation of Trades' Unions as regards the regulation of labour beneficial?" The debate was opened by Mr. Stephens in the affirmative, who was followed by eight other speakers. Upon a division the question was declared carried in the negative by a majority of seven to four. The number of members present was twenty-two.

##### LAW AMENDMENT SOCIETY.

##### REGISTRATION OF COPYRIGHT.

A meeting of the jurisprudence department of the Social Science Association was held on Monday evening, at their rooms in the Adelphi, Seymour Teulon, Esq., in the chair,

at which Mr. Serjeant Burke read a paper on "The Registration of Copyright." The paper had reference chiefly to the badly defined powers of the Act handing over registration to the Stationers' Company, and the unsatisfactory manner in which that trust had been carried out, resulting in utter complexity and confusion. The removal of the Registration Office to the Designs Office was recommended, under the *regime* of which, it was urged, the evils would entirely disappear. A discussion ensued, in which Mr. A. V. Newton, Mr. Chisholm Austey, Mr. Sampson Low, Mr. Merriman, Mr. F. Hill, and the chairman took part, after which the meeting closed.

### LAW STUDENTS' JOURNAL.

#### TRINITY TERM.

##### INTERMEDIATE EXAMINATION.

The Examiners have appointed Thursday, the 2nd May, for the intermediate examination of persons under articles of clerkship to attorneys. Candidates are to attend on that day at half past nine in the forenoon, at the Hall of the Incorporated Law Society, Chancery-lane. The examination will commence at ten o'clock precisely, and close at four o'clock.

Articles, &c., to be left with the secretary of the Incorporated Law Society on or before Saturday, the 6th April.

The regulations in all other respects are identical with those already \* published.

##### FINAL EXAMINATION.

The Examiners have appointed Tuesday, the 30th April, and Wednesday, the 1st May, for the examination of persons applying to be admitted attorneys. Candidates are to attend on those days at half-past nine in the forenoon of each day, at the Hall of the Incorporated Law Society, Chancery-lane. The examination will commence at ten o'clock precisely, and close at four o'clock.

Articles, &c., to be left with the secretary of the Incorporated Law Society, on or before Saturday, the 13th April.

In all other respects the regulations for this examination are exactly similar to those already \* published.

### COURT PAPERS.

#### CHANCERY VACATION NOTICE.

During the Easter vacation, all applications to the Court of Chancery which are of an urgent nature are to be made at the chambers of the Vice-Chancellor Sir John Stuart.

All applications *ex parte* are to be sent to the Vice-Chancellor Sir John Stuart, accompanied with the brief of counsel, a copy of the bill, a certificate of bill filed, and office copies of the affidavits in support of the application, and also a minute signed by counsel of the proposed order he may consider the applicant entitled to, and a cover capable of receiving the papers to be returned with sufficient stamps affixed thereon, and addressed as follows:—  
"To the Registrar in Vacation, Chancery Registrar's Office, Chancery-lane, London, W.C."

The papers sent to the Vice-Chancellor Sir John Stuart will, when any order is made thereon, be returned direct to the Registrar, accompanied with such order as the Vice-Chancellor Sir John Stuart may have thought fit to make thereon.

When the Vice-Chancellor Sir John Stuart declines to make any order thereon, the papers will be returned to the solicitor who sent the papers according to the address given by him.

The Vice-Chancellor Sir John Stuart's address can be obtained on application at his Honour's chambers, 11 and 12, Old-square, Lincoln's-inn.†

**SALE OF SHARES IN JOINT-STOCK BANKS.**—The object contemplated by Mr. Leeman's bill is, to a great extent, unattainable. Speculative sales and purchases of shares could not be wholly forbidden without rendering shares untransferable. This being no part of Mr. Leeman's design, the bill merely provides that every contract for the sale of shares should specify their numbers and the name of their registered owner. This provision, however, will be wholly futile. Contracts will be entered into specifying the numbers of shares not belonging to the

vendor, who, however, can have an arrangement with the owner for their transfer to a third party. Members of the Stock Exchange can combine to render the Act a dead letter; just as they rendered Sir John Barnes's Act against stock jobbing a dead letter for 130 years, until it was formally repealed in 1860. At the worst, speculative sales of shares would only require larger capitals than are at present necessary, and this want could be easily met by the establishment of joint-stock companies for the purpose. Such companies will, indeed, be prepared to buy any amounts of shares, fractional or otherwise. But they will be prepared to charge an appropriate percentage for their services. Transfers will thus be in a great measure taken out of the reach of private dealers. The cost of each transfer will be increased, and banking shares be proportionately depreciated. Mr. Leeman's bill then is, in our opinion, retrograde in point of sound mercantile theory, and will only lead to unmitigated mischief.—*Railway News*.

### PUBLIC COMPANIES.

#### ENGLISH FUNDS AND RAILWAY STOCK.

LAST QUOTATION, March 28, 1867

[From the Official List of the actual business transacted.]

##### GOVERNMENT FUNDS.

3 per Cent. Consols, 91½	Annuities, April, '85 12½
Ditto for Account, April 10, 91½	Do. (Red Sea T.) Aug. 1908 69½
3 per Cent. Reduced, 89½	Ex Bills, £1000, 4 per Ct. 15 pm
New 3 per Cent., 89½	Ditto, £500, Do 16 pm
Do. 3½ per Cent., Jan. '94	Ditto, £100 & £200, — pm
Do. 2½ per Cent., Jan. '94 72½	Bank of England Stock, 6½ per Ct. (last half-year)
Do. 5 per Cent., Jan. '73 —	Ditto for Account,
Annuities, Jan. '80 —	Annuities, April, '85 12½

##### INDIAN GOVERNMENT SECURITIES.

India Stock, 10½ p Ct. Apr. '74 217	Ind. Enf. Pr., 5 p C., Jan. '73 103½
Ditto for Account, —	Ditto, 5½ per Cent., May, '79 108½
Ditto 5 per Cent., July, '80 110½	Ditto Debentures, per Cent., April, '61 103½
Ditto for Account, —	Do. Do., 5 per Cent., Aug. '73
Ditto 4 per Cent., Oct. '88	Do. Bonds, 4 per Ct., £1000, 44 pm
Ditto, ditto, Certificates, —	Ditto, ditto, under £1000, — pm
Ditto Enfaced Ppr., 4 per Cent. 85½	

##### RAILWAY STOCK.

Shares	Railways.	Paid.	Closing Prices.
Stock Bristol and Exeter	100	81	
Stock Caledonian	100	109	
Stock Glasgow and South-Western	100	108	
Stock Great Eastern Ordinary Stock	100	27	
Stock Do., East Anglian Stock, No. 2	100	7	
Stock Great Northern	100	115	
Stock Do., A Stock*	100	121	
Stock Great Southern and Western of Ireland	100	91	
Stock Great Western—Original	100	40½	
Stock Do., West Midland—Oxford	100	25	
Stock Do., Do.—Newport	100	26	
Stock Lancashire and Yorkshire	100	122½	
Stock London, Brighton, and South Coast	100	72	
Stock London, Chatham, and Dover	100	17	
Stock London and North-Western	100	117½	
Stock London and South Western	100	79	
Stock Mauchester, Sheffield, and Lincoln	100	45½	
Stock Metropolitan	100	118	
Stock Midland	100	111½	
Stock Do., Birmingham and Derby	100	82	
Stock North British	100	33	
Stock North London	100	115	
10 Do., 1866	5	6½	
Stock North Staffordshire	100	72	
Stock Scottish Central	100	132	
Stock South Devon	100	44	
Stock South-Eastern	100	66½	
Stock Taff Vale	100	158	
10 Do., C	—	34 pm	

\* A receives no dividend until 6 per cent. has been paid to B.

#### MONEY MARKET AND CITY INTELLIGENCE.

Thursday Night

Public securities are perhaps a little firmer in tone, but the market continues to fluctuate considerably, and presents, for no long period, anything like a settled appearance. The Reform debates are, of course, not without their influence, and certain rumours are afloat as to the intentions of France upon the question of the purchase of Luxembourg. There is, however, no doubt that, during the past week, a greater activity has prevailed.

Consols are 91½ to 91½ for money, and 91½ to 91½ for the account. New Three per Cents., of which the Government broker bought largely, to-day are 89½ to 89½.

The following comparative results are exhibited by this day's Bank return:—

Rest	£3,882,192	.. Increase ..	£8,413
Public deposits	9,323,556	.. Increase ..	543,057
Other deposits	17,169,812	.. Increase ..	244,244

On the other side of the account:—

Government securities	£13,111,068	.. No change.	
Other securities	20,017,989	.. Increase ..	£1,141,251
Notes unemployed	11,246,455	.. Decrease ..	331,360

The railway department of the share market has been in a very unsettled state. This was to be expected from the Brighton engine drivers' strike, which seems to prove that the traffic of the country may at any moment be stopped by fresh demands made upon directors, who, in the interests of their proprietors, may think it wise and just to refuse acquiescence. The difficulties of the Great Western and Great Eastern have also had an unfavourable influence. The former company's report was issued to-day, from which it appears that the shareholders have only applied for £250,000 of the £1,000,000 six per cent. preference stock proposed to be issued, but the directors have been able to arrange for a large portion of the debentures falling due next month. It is proposed not to issue dividend warrants, but irredeemable five per cent. preference shares of £20 each, and where the amount of dividend due does not reach £20, an obligation will be given. With regard to the Great Eastern, a letter from the secretary states that measures have been concerted to overcome difficulties.

Bank shares maintain their ground, but are not largely dealt in.

Insurance shares do not move, and, consequently, there are no fluctuations to record.

The miscellaneous department is still inactive. The current quotations are:—Hudson's Bay shares, on a statement respecting the probable purchase of some portion of the company's territory, at one time they advanced to 16½ 16½, but they closed at 16½ per share, or only a shade firmer than on the previous afternoon; National Discount receded ½, to 12½ 12½ per share; International Financial closed at 2½ 2½ dis.; General Credit at 3½ 3 dis.; Credit Foncier at 6½ 6½ dis.; and London Financial at 18 17½ dis.

At the annual meeting of Price's Candle Company to-day, Mr. Wright, barrister, in the chair, a dividend of 2½ per cent. was declared.

It is stated that the petition to wind up the London Engineering and Iron Ship Building Company (Limited) has been withdrawn.

Legal proceedings are said to be about to be recommended by dissentient shareholders in the Russian (Vyskouski) Ironworks Company (Limited).

#### LAW UNION FIRE AND LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY.

The annual general meeting of this company was held on Wednesday, at the offices of the company, 126, Chancery-lane, Mr. James Cuddon in the chair.

The usual formalities having been duly complied with, the report and balance sheet were taken as read.

The CHAIRMAN called attention to the amount which had been received for interest on sums invested, and said that expectations of an increase had been realised, something like an additional quarter per cent. having been obtained. Under the head of assets, there was a large sum apparently due for arrears of interest, which might, at first sight, be supposed to arise from bad securities; but this was not so. Several mortgages existed for considerable amounts, upon which it had been agreed that interest should be capitalised for a year or two, and this had been done. Thus, the greater part should appear as capital, which would possibly be the case in future accounts. The new fire business was stated to amount to £10,627 in the last accounts; but it must be borne in mind that that sum extended over a period of fourteen months; and, deducting one-seventh, there would remain £9,109. For the past twelve months the sum was £10,742, being an increase of £1,600. The surplus amount received during the year for fire premiums was £2,680 14s. 10d. The directors proposed to treat £1,363, part of that, as the amount of declared profits, and carry the residue to a sum which had been accumulating for many years, and now stood at £8,018 14s. 2d. From the £1,363 it would be necessary to reserve, according to the provisions of the deed, one-fifth, to be carried to the reserve fund. This would enable the directors to pay a dividend of two per cent. One moiety of the reserve fund, which had been accumulating during the last six years from the one-fifth of profits set apart, was now to be divided, and would give a bonus of two per cent., making four per cent. from the fire business, which, added to the six per cent. provided for in the quinquennial division, made a dividend of ten per cent. By the last accounts, the new life business appeared to be £8,067 5s. 8d.; but that, as the fire account, extended over fourteen months. The new business for twelve months was £6,915; and the sum of £222,105 stated to have insured for twelve months, would be £190,945. The financial panic of the past year, as was well known, had been exceedingly severe, and, consequently, there had not been the usual amount of prudential assurance. But the company's new business for the past twelve months was as nearly as possible up to the standard of the preceding. It was £6,679 against £6,900; the sum assured being £187,000 against £190,000. The same observations he had already made about the fourteen and the twelve months applied to the renewals. The sum insured had increased in the last year £100,000, after making allowance for lapses, surrenders, and the like. They had had heavy claims during the year; but they could not be controlled; and it was generally found that, after a heavy year, a light one followed.

If they contrasted their condition with that of other similar offices in their twelfth year, it would be seen that the company's condition was very favourable. He believed their new building was as good an asset as they could possibly have, and worth more than it had cost. They had also been positively assured that the premises would not be wanted for the new law courts. He concluded by moving the adoption of the report and accounts.

Mr. HENRY MASON seconded the motion, and was of opinion that the report was highly satisfactory, having regard to the position of things during the past year. He could bear his testimony to the honesty of every figure, and of this every shareholder might satisfy himself by an examination of the books.

The motion was carried *unanimously*.

Mr. SWINBURNE moved, and Mr. F. CUDDON seconded, a motion for the payment of a dividend as recommended, which was unanimously approved.

Upon the motion of Mr. HOOKE, seconded by Mr. MOUNSEY, the retiring directors were unanimously re-elected.

Mr. R. W. ROBERTS moved, and Mr. MAUDE seconded, the appointment of Mr. Theodore Waterhouse as shareholders' auditor, *vice* Mr. R. P. Harding, resigned; and the motion was unanimously carried.

Mr. Francis Worsley was re-elected directors' auditor, and a sum of thirty guineas voted for his services during the past year.

The CHAIRMAN highly complimented Mr. McGedy upon his energy, zeal, and attention; and moved a vote of thanks to that gentleman.

Mr. BURGESS seconded the motion, and it was cordially carried.

The SECRETARY returned thanks, and begged to couple the names of Mr. Rogers, the Chief Clerk, and Mr. Stower, the chief of the life department.

The customary compliment to the Chairman concluded the proceedings.

#### ESTATE EXCHANGE REPORT.

##### AT THE GUILDFHALL COFFEEHOUSE.

March 14.—By Mr. MARSH.

Freehold ground rents, amounting to £498 per annum, arising from an estate in Cornwall-road, Cornwall-street, Victoria-street, Allington-street, Frederick-street, and Brandon-street, Brixton—Lot 1 sold for £195. Lot 2 sold for £145. Lot 3 sold for £145. Lot 4 sold for £35. Lot 5 sold for £160. Lot 6 sold for £160. Lot 7 sold for £160. Lot 9 sold for £499. Lot 11 sold for £120. Lot 12 sold for £160. Lot 14 sold for £200. Lot 15 sold for £240. Lot 17 sold for £400. Lot 23 sold for £200. Lot 24 sold for £200. Lot 27 sold for £240. Lot 28 sold for £210. Lot 29 sold for £240. Lot 30 sold for £60. Lot 31 sold for £120. Lot 32 sold for £120.

March 26.—By Messrs. BROAD, Pritchard, & WILTSHIRE. Freehold business premises, Nos. 209 and 210, Blackfriars-road; estimated annual value, £190—Sold for £660. Leasehold house, No. 21, Fleet-road, St. John's-park, Hampstead; let at £40 per annum; term, 87½ years from 1843, at £8 per annum—Sold for £360. Leasehold house, No. 22, Fleet-road; let at £40 per annum; term and ground-rent similar to above—Sold for £360. Leasehold-house, No. 1, Thurlow-terrace, Wandsworth-road; let at £30 per annum; term, 99 years from 1855, at £5 per annum—Sold for £220.

By Messrs. E. & H. LUMLEY.

Freehold ground-rent of £250 per annum, secured on warehouses, vaults, and premises situate in George-street, Trinity-square, Tower-hill—Sold for £5,600.

Leasehold ground-rents, amounting to £270 1s. per annum (for 90 years), arising out of 30 residences situate at Lee, Kent—Sold for £4,750.

Leasehold, 4 residences (2 in carcass), situate in the Solihurst-park-road, South Norwood; estimated annual value, £70 per house; term, 80 years from 1855, at £10 10s. each per annum—Sold for £1,080.

##### AT THE MART.

March 22.—By Messrs. NORTON, TAIST, WATNEY & CO. Leasehold residence, known as "Oakfield-house," with stabling, grounds, &c., the whole containing about 2 acres, situate at Norwood, Surrey—Sold for £3,500.

Leasehold premises, No. 72, Lombard-street: term, 82 years from 1866, at £180 for the first 8 years, and £440 afterwards—Sold for £2,500.

By Mr. ROBERT REID.

Freehold residence, No. 23, Dawson-place, Pembridge-square, Bayswater—Sold for £2,710.

Leasehold residence, No. 18, Upper Woburn-place, Tavistock-square; estimated annual value, £120; term, 56 years unexpired, at £28 per annum—Sold for £1,300.

March 26.—By Messrs. BROMLEY, SON, & KELDAY.

Ten £50 shares in the Eagle Life Insurance Society—Sold for £66.

By Messrs. J. J. CLEMMANS & SON.

Leasehold ground-rents, amounting to £52 2s. per annum (for 22 years), secured upon houses and premises situate near the canal, Commercial-road, Peckham—Sold for £480.

Leasehold business premises, situate No. 7, Stanley-street, Herbert-street, Hoxton; let at £50 per annum; term, 77 years from 1865, at £10 per annum—Sold for £195.

Leasehold house, No. 29, Thomas-street, Duke-street, Stamford-street, Blackfriars; let at £26 per annum; term, 14½ years unexpired, at £3 7s. per annum—Sold for £140.

annum; term, 84½ years unexpired, at £4 per annum—Sold for £190.

By Mr. G. GOULDSTHORPE.

Leasehold residence, No. 9, Cadogan-place, Belgrave square, let on lease at £123 per annum; term, 17 years unexpired, at a pepper-corn—Sold for £1,000.

### BIRTHS, MARRIAGES, AND DEATHS.

#### BIRTHS.

BLAKE—On March 19, at Ryston Lodge, Putney, the wife of Francis William Blake, Esq., Solicitor, of a son.

DOMMETT—On March 23, at 2, Beaumont-villas, Belvedere road, Upper Norwood, the wife of C. W. Dommett, Esq., Solicitor, of a daughter.

FORSTER—On March 25, at 2, Gloucester-street, Portman-square, the wife of William Stewart Forster, Esq., Solicitor, of a daughter.

HARDING—On March 21, at the Firs, Harborne, near Birmingham, the wife of William Stewart Harding, Esq., Solicitor, of a son.

HARPER—On March 26, at 23, Canbury-square, the wife of Thomas Etheridge Harper, Esq., Solicitor, of a son.

LAWSON—On March 27, at The Grove, Blackheath, the wife of William Norton Lawson, Esq., Barrister-at-Law, of a daughter.

LOWNDES—On March 25, at Enfield, the wife of Robert Baxter Lowndes, Esq., Solicitor, of a daughter.

RYAN—On March 18, at 16, Onslow-gardens, Fulham-road, the wife of Arthur Compton Ryan, Esq., Solicitor, of a son.

SHAW—On March 26, at Fernwood, Clapham-common, Surrey, the wife of William Henry Shaw, Esq., Solicitor, of a son.

STOCK—On March 29, at 100, Lansdowne-road, W., the wife of Edward W. Stock, Esq., Barrister-at-Law, of a son.

STRINGER—On March 24, at New Romney, Kent, the wife of Henry Stringer, Esq., Solicitor, of a son.

#### MARRIAGES.

HYDE—WILSON—On March 23, at St. James's Church, Louth, William Hyde, jun., Esq., Solicitor, of Louth, to Constance, daughter of James William Wilson, Esq., Solicitor, also of Louth.

JACOBS—MEYER—On March 27, at the residence of the parents of the bride, Emily, daughter of Meyer Meyer, Esq., of 53, Gordon-square, London, to Joseph Lyon Jacobs, Esq., Solicitor, of 16, King-street-square, Hull.

LAWRENCE—LILLICRAPP—On March 21, at the Catholic Cathedral, Plymouth, Richard Chas. Pasley, Asst.-Surgeon H.M.'s Flag Ship Royal Alfred, son of Ralph Crofton, Lawrence, Esq., Barrister-at-Law, to Martha, daughter of the late Wm. Bryant Lillicrap, Esq. of Plymouth.

SMALE—GUARD—On March 21, at the Parish Church, Langtree, Devon, Charles, son of Charles Smale, Esq., Solicitor, of Bideford, to Charlotte, daughter of the Rev. John Guard, rector of Langtree.

TILLY—WEBB—On March 20, at St. Thomas's Episcopal Church, Edinburgh, Captain John Tilly, 23rd Royal Welsh Fusiliers, son of the late Tobias Harry Tilly, Esq., Solicitor, of Falmouth, to Isabella Maria, daughter of P. Robert Webb, Esq., of 13, Buckingham-terrace, Edinburgh.

WHALE—CHAPMAN—On March 23, at Sarnfawr, Glamorganshire, Thomas Martin Whale, Esq., Royal Marines Light Infantry, to Dora, daughter of the late Edmund Chapman, Esq., Barrister-at-Law.

#### DEATHS.

ALLISON—On March 18, at Louth, William Grant Allison, Esq., Solicitor, of that place, aged 69.

BOWERBANK—On March 24, at 2, East-ascent, St. Leonard's-on-Sea, Caroline, wife of J. S. Bowerbank, LL.D., aged 61.

CURREY—On March 18, at Blackheath, Georgina Innes, wife of Frederick Currey, Esq., Barrister-at-Law, Lincoln's-inn.

HOOKER—Between the 1st and 22nd Dec., at Undallagh, Queensland, accidentally drowned, Thomas Ayerst Hooker, son of the late James Hooker, Esq., Solicitor, of London and Croydon, aged 32.

HUGGINS—On March 21, at Albion-street, Hyde park-square, Edward Hastings, son of H. C. Huggins, LL.D., Barrister-at-Law.

PHILLIPS—On March 22, at Hastings, Phoebe Patience, wife of John Phillips, Esq., Solicitor, aged 41.

ROMILLY—On March 22, at 29, Wilton-crescent, Lady Georgina Elizabeth Romilly, wife of Charles Romilly, Esq., Barrister-at-Law, Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, aged 46.

TUCKER—On March 19, at Cannes, South of France, Margaret Anne, wife of Marwood Tucker, Esq., Barrister-at-Law, of 28, Wilton-place, Knightsbridge, aged 25.

WEBB—On March 20, at 18, Campden-hill-road, Kensington, Maria Louisa, wife of Henry Webb, Esq., Solicitor, aged 31.

### LONDON GAZETTES.

#### Wind-ing-up of Joint Stock Companies.

FRIDAY, March 22, 1867.

#### LIMITED IN CHANCERY.

London and Colonial Company (Limited).—Vice-Chancellor Wood has, by an order dated March 16, ordered that the voluntary winding up of this company be continued. Gregory & Co., Bedford-row, solicitors for the petitioner.

General Estates Company (Limited).—Creditors are required, on or before April 27, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to George Fagg & Alfred Augustus James, 18, King-st., Cheapside. Saturday, May 4 at 12, is appointed for hearing and adjudicating upon the debts and claims.

City of London and Colonial Financial Association (Limited).—Petition for winding up, presented March 21, directed to be heard before Vice-Chancellor Stuart on April 20. Emmets & Co., Bloomsbury-eq., solicitors for the petitioner.

United Merthyr Collieries Company (Limited).—Vice-Chancellor Wood has, by an order dated March 11, ordered that the voluntary winding up of this company be continued. Jones, Old Jewry-chambers, solicitor for the petitioner.

#### UNLIMITED IN CHANCERY.

London and Eastern Banking Corporation.—Vice-Chancellor Wood

has, by an order dated March 11, directed that a Fourth Dividend of two shillings in the pound on all the debts which have been proved or allowed against the corporation be paid to the several creditors entitled thereto, and such dividend may be received upon application at the office of John Bell, 3, Moorgate-st. on Wednesday, March 27, or on any succeeding Wednesday between the hours of 12 and 3.

TUESDAY, March 26, 1867.

#### LIMITED IN CHANCERY.

Whitehall Engineering Company (Limited).—Petition for winding up, presented March 16, directed to be heard before Vice-Chancellor Malins on April 26. Torr & Co., Bedford-row, solicitors for the petitioner.

Estates' Investment Company (Limited).—The Master of the Rolls has, by an order dated March 16, ordered that this company be wound up. Atchison and Hathaway solicitors for the petitioner. Penhale and Lemax Consolidated Silver Lead Mining Company (Limited).—Petition for winding up presented March 22, directed to be heard before Vice-Warden at 18, Thurloe-sq., Brompton, on April 1 at 11.30. Affidavits intended to be used at the hearing in opposition to the petition must be filed at the Registrar's Office, Truro on or before April 1. Hodge & Co., Truro, Petitioners' Solicitors.

#### Friendly Societies Dissolved.

FRIDAY, March 22, 1867.

Friendly Society, Bell-inn, Barton-under-Needwood, Stafford March 19.

#### Creditors under Estates in Chancery.

Last Day of Proof.

FRIDAY, March 22, 1867.

Brown, Jas, Dover-st, Piccadilly, Hotel Keeper. April 16. Brown v Swanston, M. R.

De Fontes, Amédée Theodore Davesies, Eyford House, Gloucester, General Officer in the French Army. April 20. Irvine v Sullivan, V. C. Wood.

Kershaw, Ralph, Ashton-under-Lyne, Cotton Spinner. April 16. Kershaw v Kershaw, M. R.

Senior, Nassau Wm, In re, Hyde-pk-gate, Kensington Gore, Esq. April 10, V. C. Malins.

Southouse, Ann, Mansell-st, Goodman's-fields, Widow. May 1. Southouse v Cochran, V. C. Stuart.

Western, Jas, Bath, Esq. April 15. Western v Western, V. C. Wood.

TUESDAY, March 26, 1867.

Clifford, Jas, Shardlow, Derby, Esq. April 29. Cullen v Cullen, V. C. Malins.

Hooper, Jas, Battles Hall, Stapleford Abbots, Essex, Farmer. April 30. Leuchars v Hooper, V. C. Stuart.

Huins, Jas, Birm, Gent. April 22. Huins v Huins, M. R.

Oliver, Geo, Kingston, Sussex, Esq. April 10. Oliver v Oliver, M. R.

Rapson, Benj, Paradise-row, Hackney, and Eliz Rapson, Grove Brooksbys-walk, Homerton, Widow. April 17. Rapson v Rapson, M. R.

Patrick, Thos Guy, Linstock, Cumberland, Yeoman. April 18. Donald v Patrick, V. C. Malins.

Thomas, David, Pwllwyd, Carmarthen, Esq. May 1. Thomas v Thomas, V. C. Stuart.

#### Creditors under 22 & 23 Vict. cap. 35.

Last Day of Claim.

FRIDAY, March 22, 1867.

Atkins, Caroline Martin, Victoria-rd, Clapham, Widow. May 20. Collins, Reading.

Barmby, Mary Mentrup, Sutton-in-Holderness, York, Spinster. May 18. Holdier & Sons, Hull.

Bentley, Benj, Huddersfield, York, Gent. April 20. Clough, Huddersfield.

Birkenhead, John Fell, Gt James-st, Bedford-row, Gent. May 1. Stephena & Mathewes, Essex-st, Strand.

Elsworth, John, Doncaster, York, Builder. June 15. Fisher.

Fairfield, John, West Derby, nr Liverpool, Merchant. May 1. Richardson & Co., Liverpool.

Fisher, Mary Norman, Bath, Widow. May 7. Freshfields & Newman, Bank-buildings.

Hall, John, sen, Newbury, Berks, Bricklayer. April 30. Cowper, Newbury.

Hardwick, Fredk Wilson, Leigh, Worcester, Major. June 1. Haynes, Leamington.

Hargrave, Wm Whitehead, Wakefield, York, Painter. Sept 8. Harrison & Smith, Wakefield.

Hayward, Mary Catherine, Deptford, Kent, Widow. May 1. Stuart & Massey, Gray's-inn-eq.

Hunt, Richd, Feltham, Middx, Esq. May 1. Broughton, Finsbury-eq.

Leatton, Ellis, Southsea, Southampton, Spinster. June 1. De Jersey & Co, Gresham-st, West.

Nias, Charlotte, Brighton, Sussex, Widow. May 1. Broughton, Finsbury-eq.

Smith, Sarah, North Shields, Northumberland, Widow. May 1. Tiley & Co.

Strauss, Louis Wm, Mile-end-eq, Licensed Victualler. April 30. Walker & Moogen, Southampton-st, Bloomsbury.

Sugden, Isabella, Woodsome Lea, York, Widow. April 20. Clough, Huddersfield.

Trotties, Geo, Whitchurch, York, Gent. May 1. Walker & Co, Whitchurch.

TUESDAY, March 26, 1867.

Baxter, Wm, Marlborough-road, Chelsea. April 30. Pearce, Rectory-pl, Woolwich.

Blondell, Thos, Shorelditch, Licensed Victualler. May 1. Hyde & Tandy, Ely-pl.

Caneaux, Louis Marie, John-st, Crutched Friars, Wine Merchant. June 1. Jones, Saxe-lane.

Carr, Chas Field, Charles-st, Westbourne-ter. August 1. Carr, St Mildred's-ct, Poultry.

Clarke, John, Muswell-hill Farm, Colney Hatch, Farmer. May 15. Scott, Basinghall-st.

Cox, Jas, Westmorland-pl, City-rd, Gent. May 1. Roscoe & Hincks, King-st, Finsbury-sq.

Firth, John, Douglas, Isle of Man, Merchant. May 6. Rawson & Co, Bradford.

Gallimore, Isaac, Cranage, Chester, Farmer. May 1. Hall & Janion, Manch.

Gatley, Wm Carpenter, Truro, Cornwall, Mariner. April 15. Carlyon & Paul, Truro.

Gibbons, Mary Eliz. June 1. Nelson & Co, Leeds.

Lawrence, Geo, Fenchurch-st, Gent. May 20. Hammond, Furnival's-inn.

Lawson, Saml, Headingley, Leeds. May 10. Barr & Co, Leeds.

Mitchell, Geo, Gray's-inn-rid, Picture Frame Manufacturer. May 15. Scott, Basinghall-st.

Monro, Rev Edward, Leeds, Clerk. April 10. Barret, Leeds.

Phineas, Thos, Pall-mall, Barrister-at-Law. June 1. Valpy & Ledsam, Lincoln's-inn-fields.

Ramsden, John, York, Fruiterer. April 15. Grayston, jun, York.

Slack, Joseph, Forton, Stafford, Farmer. April 20. Heane & Son, Newport.

Sparkhill, Eliz, Wymondham, Norfolk, Widow. April 30. Mitchell & Clarke, Wymondham.

Townsend, Joseph, Saville-row, Middx, Aural Surgeon. June 1. Valpy & Ledsam, Lincoln's-inn-fields.

Wakefield, Alice, Halifax, Widow. May 6. Clark, Ludlow.

**Deeds registered pursuant to Bankruptcy Act, 1861.**

**FRIDAY, March 22, 1867.**

Anderson, Wm, Keighley, York, Draper. March 5. Asst. Reg March 22.

Arrowsmith, Jas, Thorley, Durham, Joiner. Feb 27. Comp. Reg March 21.

Beard, John, & Joseph Wilkinson, Rainow, Chester, Cotton Spinners. March 9. Comp. Reg March 22.

Belshaw, Wm, sen, Wm Belshaw, jun, & Robt, Belshaw, Nottingham, Elastic Web Manufacturers. Feb 22. Comp. Reg March 22.

Bennets, Geo, Totnes, Devon, Merchant. March 19. Asst. Reg March 21.

Boyle, Geo, Bideford, Devon, Draper. March 16. Comp. Reg March 19.

Bridgman, Geo, St Dominic, Cornwall, Yeoman. March 6. Comp. Reg March 19.

Brookes, Thos, Lpool, Cement Dealer. Feb 22. Asst. Reg March 21.

Burt, Ephraim, Walworth-rid, Portman-st, Maker. March 19. Comp. Reg March 22.

Chandler, Wm, Tibberton, Gloucester, Butcher. March 5. Comp. Reg March 12.

Cowling, Wm, Larbriggan, Cornwall, Farmer. March 16. Asst. Reg March 20.

Crewe, Edwin, Sandbach, Cheshire, Grocer. Feb 22. Comp. Reg March 20.

Crossman, Wm, Hy, Norfolk-ter, Brixton, Gent. March 21. Comp. Reg March 22.

Delf, Wm, Beccles, Suffolk, Ironfounder. Feb 23. Asst. Reg March 20.

Dunkley, Thos, Island of Portland, Baker. Feb 22. Asst. Reg March 20.

Elliott, Wm, Gore, Paington, Devon, Hotel Keeper. March 18. Asst. Reg March 20.

Engel, Bernard, Elm-villas, Tottenham, Gent. March 19. Asst. Reg March 20.

Evans, Danl, Pontardawe, Glamorgan, Timber Merchant. Feb 26. Asst. Reg March 22.

Forrester, Geo, South Shields, Durham, Beerhouse Keeper. Feb 21. Asst. Reg March 21.

Foster, Thorpe, Gt Driffield, York, Butcher. Feb 23. Asst. Reg March 20.

Gardner, John Hy, Sowe, Warwick, Miller. March 18. Asst. Reg March 21.

Gell, John, Derby, Plumber. March 8. Asst. Reg March 22.

Goddon, Edwd, Canterbury, Kent, Licensed Victualler. March 20. Comp. Reg March 21.

Goodere, John Hy, Newport, Monmouth, Gent. Feb 20. Asst. Reg March 19.

Gregory, Anne, Cheltenham, Gloucester, Milliner. Feb 21. Asst. Reg March 21.

Green, Solomon, Goulston-st, Whitechapel, Beerhouse Keeper. March 18. Comp. Reg March 21.

Hammond, Hy Stanley, Cardiff, Glamorgan, Grocer. March 20. Comp. Reg March 21.

Hepton, Wm, Whisby, York, Chemist. Feb 21. Asst. Reg March 21.

Hinge, Edwd, Milton-next-Sittingbourne, Kent, Tailor. Feb 6. Comp. Reg March 5.

Hedgkinson, Geo, Astbury Marsh, Chester, Grocer. Feb 27. Asst. Reg March 21.

Hodson, Wm Fras, King's Norton, Worcester, Commercial Traveller. March 6. Asst. Reg March 19.

Hum, David, St Michael's-alley, Cornhill, Bootmaker. March 4. Comp. Reg March 21.

Jocelyn, Hon. Augustus Geo Fredk, Warwick-st. March 15. Comp. Reg March 22.

Keating, John, Congleton, Chester, Mail Driver. March 2. Comp. Reg March 21.

Kirby, Geo, son, Faversham, Kent, Stonemason. Feb 21. Comp. Reg March 18.

Langmaid, Saml, Landport, Hants, Bootmaker. March 12. Asst. Reg March 21.

Leyster, Mary, Headless Cross, Worcester, Widow. Feb 25. Comp. Reg March 21.

Lingest, Chas, Nottingham, Boot Manufacturer. March 16. Comp. Reg March 22.

Mackay, John May, Yealmpton, Devon, Grocer. March 7. Asst. Reg March 12.

Manser, Wm, Norwich, Coke Merchant. March 4. Comp. Reg March 22.

Mosey, Mary, Leeds, Saddler. Feb 26. Comp. Reg March 22.

Newton, Robt, Bridgwater, Somerset, Innkeeper. Feb 28. Asst. Reg March 20.

Phillips, Charlotte, St Stephen's-rid, Shepherd's Bush, Widow. March 7. Comp. Reg March 20.

Pickton, Wm, Warrington, Lancaster, Grocer. March 8. Asst. Reg March 21.

Piercy, Benj, Duke-st, Westminster, Civil Engineer. March 15. Inspectorship. Reg March 22.

Pressland, Caleb, Brighton, Draper. March 11. Asst. Reg March 21.

Purves, Joseph, Sunderland, Durham, Bootmaker. Feb 23. Asst. Reg March 22.

Quick, Fryer Grendenning, Bath, Draper. March 15. Comp. Reg March 21.

Scott, Anthony, South Stockton, York, Beerhouse Keeper. Feb 25. Asst. Reg March 21.

Stark, Robt Barnes, Wisbech, St Peter's, Cambridge, Butcher. Feb 21. Conv. Reg March 19.

Smith, John, Scarborough, York, Lodging-house Keeper. March 19. Asst. Reg March 22.

Smith, Alfred, Hanley, Stafford, Draper. Feb 21. Asst. Reg March 21.

Smith, Jas Crucifix Robt, Birn, Theatrical Stage Manager. March 1. Comp. Reg March 19.

Stark, Saml, Cheltenham, Gloucester, Draper. March 20. Comp. Reg March 21.

Stebbins, Wm Fredk, Oxford, Racing Comm Agent. March 15. Comp. Reg March 21.

Summers, Frances Jane, Little Britain, Widow. Feb 21. Comp. Reg March 20.

Waddington, John, Blackburn, Lancaster, Contractor. Feb 20. Asst. Reg March 19.

Walker, Geo, Tunstall, Stafford, Grocer. Feb 22. Asst. Reg March 21.

Waite, Wm, Potters, Wilts, Builder. Feb 22. Asst. Reg March 19.

Webb, John, Coburg-house, Deptford, Draper. March 18. Asst. Reg March 20.

Webster, Richd, Redhill, Surrey, Schoolmaster. Feb 23. Comp. Reg March 20.

Wheeler, Hy, Stainton-ter, Bermondsey, Brush Manufacturer. March 13. Comp. Reg March 20.

White, Anthony Edmd Dyer, Princess-st, Leicester-sq, Upholsterer. Feb 7. Comp. Reg March 6.

Wilkinson, Joseph, Barnsley, York, Joiner. March 9. Comp. Reg March 21.

**TUESDAY, March 26, 1867.**

Allen, John, Egremont, Chester, Builder. March 1. Asst. Reg March 25.

Ashby, Saml, Northampton, Currier. March 6. Asst. Reg March 23.

Bothe, Augustus, South Molton-st, Middx, Tailor. March 18. Comp. Reg March 25.

Booth, Wm, Ashton-under-Lyne, Grocer. March 15. Asst. Reg March 25.

Bradbury, Sphn, Weston-super-Mare, Somerset, Pawnbroker. March 6. Asst. Reg March 22.

Bridges, Jane, Oxford, Widow. March 8. Comp. Reg March 22.

Carman, Wm, Hamilton, South End, Kensington. March 21. Comp. Reg March 22.

Carter, Eliz, Brighton, Licensed Victualler. March 12. Comp. Reg March 25.

Chadwick, Fredk, Westminster-chambers, Victoria-st, Architect. March 6. Comp. Reg March 26.

Chadwick, Thos, March, Grocer. March 21. Asst. Reg March 25.

Clark, Wm Obadiah, Gates-st, Upper North-st, Baker. March 25. Comp. Reg March 26.

Claxton, Wm Richds, Lpool, Auctioneer. March 14. Comp. Reg March 23.

Cook, Chas, Chelmsford, Essex, Livery Stable Keeper. March 9. Comp. Reg March 23.

Cook, John Hy, Oakley-st, Chelsea, Surgeon. March 22. Comp. Reg March 26.

Craven, Edwin, Bradford, York, Stuff Merchant. Feb 27. Asst. Reg March 23.

Crewdson, John, Ulverston, Lancaster, Shoemaker. March 1. Asst. Reg March 26.

Dane, Edwd Alfred, Union-chambers, Union-st, Old Broad-st, Merchant. March 7. Comp. Reg March 25.

Davies, Anne, St Clears, Carmarthen, Widow. Feb 23. Comp. Reg March 25.

Day, Thos Smoothery, Balham-hill, Corn Merchant. March 7. Comp. Reg March 26.

Devis, Naomi, Gt Bridge, Stafford, Plumber. March 14. Comp. Reg March 23.

Eyre, Manuel, Burghley-rid, Kentish-town, Gent. March 26. Comp. Reg March 26.

Fitzmaurice, Wm Gordon, Montague-pl, Poplar, Schoolmaster. March 16. Comp. Reg March 23.

Frazier, John, North Shields, Northumberland, Painter. Feb 25. Asst. Reg March 23.

Frise, Saml, Pembroke Dock, Pembroke, Licensed Victualler. Feb 25. Comp. Reg March 23.

Fulford, Wm, Leeds, Currier. Feb 28. Asst. Reg March 25.

Friend, Marian, Deptford, Stationer. March 22. Comp. Reg March 25.

Goodman, Richd, West Haddon, Northampton, Plumber. Feb 26. Asst. Reg March 25.

Hannin, Wm, Bristol, Beerhouse-keeper. March 7. Asst. Reg March 25.

Harrison, Thos, Nottingham, Dealer in Ales. Feb 25. Comp. Reg March 25.

Heard, John Broom, Northam, Devon, Grocer. March 20. Comp. Reg March 25.

Henry, David Joseph, Graham-house, Old Broad-st, Iron Merchant. Feb 27. Asst. Reg March 22.

Hollander, Geo Reuben, Cardiff, Glamorgan, Pawnbroker. March 21. Comp. Reg March 26.

Horsfield, Thos, Birn, Tailor. March 9. Comp. Reg March 26.

Howell, Edwd, Lpool, Car Proprietor. March 5. Asst. Reg March 22.

Hull, Rev John Winstanley, North Muskham, Nottingham, Clerk. March 6. Comp. Reg March 25.

Jenner, Geo Herbert, Anderton's Hotel, Comm Agent. March 15. Comp. Reg March 26.

John, Thos, Canton, Glamorgan, Publican. Feb 23. Asst. Reg March 23.

Johnson, Wm, St Albans, Herts, Licensed Victualler. March 14. Comp. March 26.

Jones, Hy, Hull, Draper. Feb 27. Asst. Reg March 25.

Lee, Fred Jonathan, & Alfred Timothy Lee, Bristol, Grocers. March 8. Asst. Reg March 23.

Lewis, Emma, Birn, Widow. March 2. Comp. Reg March 23.

Lloyd, Charles Rees, Lorrimore-sq, Camberwell, Clerk. March 25. Comp. Reg March 26.

Manning, Geo Theodore, Springfield, Essex, Tutor. Feb 28. Comp. Reg March 23.

Manson, John, jun., Leadenhall-st, Wine & Spirit Merchant. March 18. Comp. Reg March 23.

Mayors, John, South Shields, Durham, Blacksmith. Feb 25. Asst. Reg March 23.

Metcalfe, John, Lpool, Stationer. March 23. Comp. Reg March 25.

Michaelis, Matias, Graces-alley, Wellclose-sq, Outfitter. March 14. Comp. Reg March 22.

Mole, Joseph, Croydon, Corn Dealer. March 23. Comp. Reg March 26.

Nathan, John, Ashton-under-Lyne Lancaster, Clock and Watch Maker. March 21. Comp. Reg March 25.

Newsham, John, Preston, Lancaster, Overlooker. Feb 11. Comp. Reg March 25.

Nordon, Joseph, Shoreditch, Tobacconist. March 4. Comp. Reg March 22.

Olden, Edwin, Oldbury, Worcester, Grocer. March 8. Asst. Reg March 25.

Owen, Joseph, Rastrick, nr Brighouse, York, Forgemans. Feb 23. Asst. Reg March 22.

Paine, Thos, Barnabas, Gravesend, Kent, Draper. March 6. Comp. Reg March 20.

Palfrey, Joseph, Dover, Kent, Grocer. March 15. Asst. Reg March 25.

Pearson, Lawrence, Kirkham, Lancaster, Stonemason. Feb 11. Comp. Reg March 25.

Perry, Frances, Treslin, Regent-st, Jeweller. March 20. Comp. Reg March 22.

Poole, Thos, & Saml Poole, Shrewsbury, Salop, Drapers. Feb 25. Asst. Reg March 25.

Robinson, Alfred, Birkenhead, Chester, Grocer. March 1. Comp. Reg March 26.

Robinson, Jas Cook, New-st, City-rd, Comm Agent. March 20. Comp. Reg March 25.

Rogers, Wm Peter John, Vanbrugh-pk-rd, Blackheath, Builder. March 13. Inspectorship. Reg March 19.

Rudkin, Thos, Swindon, Leicester, Slate Merchant. March 18. Asst. Reg March 25.

Sawyer, John Wm, Arthur-st East, Builder. Feb 25. Asst. Reg March 25.

Scaife, Thos, Pickering, York, Painter. Feb 25. Conv. Reg March 23.

Scott, John Thos, Upton, Devon, Builder. March 11. Conv. Reg March 23.

Simpson, Edwd, & James Fatteson Simpson, North Shields, Millers. March 1. Asst. Reg March 26.

Slatter, Joseph, St Ives, Huntingdon, Ironmonger. March 16. Comp. Reg March 23.

Smith, John Thos, Burdalem, Stafford, Draper. March 1. Asst. Reg March 25.

Smith, Geo Wm, Knowle-rd, Brixton-rd, Watchmaker. March 19. Comp. Reg March 23.

Stansford, Elwd, Bedford, Currier. March 12. Asst. Reg March 22.

Stanton, Geo, Fairfield, nr Lpool, Contractor. March 8. Comp. Reg March 25.

Stone, Wm, Birn, Grocer. March 8. Comp. Reg March 25.

Stray, Fredk, Haymarket, Tailor. March 14. Comp. Reg March 25.

Terry, Cornelius, Birn, Cut Nail Manufacturer. March 14. Comp. Reg March 23.

Theobald, John, Oxford-ter, Edgware-rd, Gent. March 14. Comp. Reg March 26.

Tooth, Alfred, London-st, Gent. March 26. Comp. Reg March 26.

Turner, James Llewellyn, Wolverhampton, Stafford, Grocer. March 7. Asst. Reg March 25.

Walker, Herbert, Chesterfield, Derby, Fruiterer. March 19. Comp. Reg March 25.

Walker, James, King's-rd, Chelsea, Fishmonger. Feb 28. Comp. Reg March 23.

Walker, Maria, Manch, Umbrella Manufacturer. March 8. Comp. Reg March 25.

Warden, John, Lpool, Nautical Instrument Maker. March 13. Comp. Reg March 21.

Watkins, Thos, Bolding, Birn, Retail Brewer. March 14. Comp. Reg March 22.

Watling, Chas, Stewart's-lane, Battersea-fields, Baker. March 12. Comp. Reg March 20.

Wesson, James Shilcock, Preston, Lancaster, Draper. Feb 25. Asst. Reg March 22.

White, William, Cavisham-rd, Kentish Town, Builder. Feb 23. Comp. Reg March 23.

Whitham, William, and Thomas Whitham, Manch, Woollen Merchants. March 7. Comp. Reg March 25.

Widdison, William, Mashbrough Mill, Rotherham, York, Corn Miller. March 1. Comp. Reg March 25.

**Bankrupts.**

**FRIDAY, March 22, 1867.**

To Surrender in London.

Bacon, Wm, jun., Union-st, Spitalfields, Pastry-cook. Pet March 18. April 10 at 12. Beetholme, Gt Coram-st, Brunswick-sq.

Bayley, Richd Albert Watkin, Prisoner for Debt, Reading. Adj March 16. April 10 at 1.

Bird, Geo, Fitroy-yd, Regent's-pk, Cab Proprietor. Pet March 20. April 10 at 2. Duffield & Brunt, Tokenhouse-yd.

Bonner, Robt, Brighton, Plumber. Pet March 5. April 10 at 12. Harrier & Co, Old Jewry.

Colls, Vincent, Leicester-pl, Saffron-hill, Hatton-garden, Looking Glass Frame Manufacturer. Pet March 18. April 11 at 1. Maraden, Friday-st, Cheapside.

Cutter, Wm, Noble-st, Warehouseman. Pet March 16. April 10 at 1. Miller & Stubbs, Eastcheap.

Foster, Wm, Golden-lane, St Luke's, General-shop Keeper. Pet March 19. April 15 at 11. Porter, Coleman-st.

Grant, John, Brown's-lane, Spitalfields, Licensed Victualler. Pet March 19. April 10 at 2. Porter, Coleman-st.

Grinstead, Jas, & Chas Cox, Bishopsgate-st Without, Drapers. Pet March 19. April 11 at 1. Bannister, Basinghall-st.

Harding, Hy, West Tarring, nr Worthing, Sussex, Lodging-house Keeper. Pet March 18. April 10 at 2. Stanier & Doanithorne, Austin-friars.

Hill, Hy Augustus, Linton-st, Islington, Clerk. Pet March 20. April 10 at 3. Harrison, Basinghall-st.

Holland, Wm Edwd, Colchester, Essex, Bootmaker. Pet March 4. April 17 at 11. Jones, Colchester.

Hollebone, Hy, Duke-st, Portland-pl, Tailor. Pet March 20. April 10 at 2. Cotton, Bell-yd, Doctors' commons.

Hollen, Lavinia Caroline Von, Brewer-st, Goswell-rd, Milliner. Pet March 19. April 11 at 2. Blake & Co, College-hill.

Lester, Chas, Shouldham-st, Bryanstone-sq, Mercantile Clerk. Pet March 14. April 10 at 11. Silvester, Gt Dover-st.

Madden, Wm Thos, Belvedere, Kent, Bootmaker. Pet March 18. April 11 at 1. Goldrick, Strand.

Malgarini, Fredk Lewis, Lunatic Prisoner for Debt. Pet March 18 (for pau). April 10 at 12.

Mills, Hy Penny, Cobden-at, Camberwell, Law Writer. Pet March 19. April 10 at 1. Brown, Basinghall-st.

Perfect, Hy, Prisoner for Debt, London. Pet March 20 (for pau). April 10 at 2. Harrison, Basinghall-st.

Sard, Jas John, Bovis-marks, Iron Plate Worker. Pet March 18. April 10 at 1. Hicks, Coleman-st.

Squires, Chas, Frederick-st, Caledonian-rd, Plumber. Pet March 19. April 10 at 2. Pearce, Giltspur-st.

Tillet, Saml, Spring-at, Portman sq, Manager of a Boerhouse. Pet March 19. April 10 at 2. Towne, Gt Russell-sq, Bloomsbury.

Trowell, Fras, jun., High-st, Deptford, Linendraper. Pet March 15. April 10 at 1. Reed & Co, Gresham-st.

White, Hy, Lutecia-rd, Kennington, Clerk. Pet March 20. April 15 at 11. Brown, Basinghall-st.

To Surrender in the Country.

Adcock, Thos, Lincoln, Dealer in Hardware. Pet March 18. Lincoln. April 4 at 11. Rox, Lincoln.

Adjour, Michael, Manch, Merchant. Pet March 18. March, April 5 at 11. Heywood, Manch.

Axtom, Chas, Amersham, Buckingham, Assistant to a Tailor. Pet March 20. Chesham, April 3 at 3. Daniels, Fore-st.

Bentley, Moses, Blackford-bridge, nr Bury, Lancaster. Pet March 18. Bury, April 4 at 10. Anderton, Bury.

Bourne, Alfred, Stouting, Kent, General Dealer. Pet March 19. Hythe, April 3 at 11. Minter, Folkestone.

Bowcutt, Edwd, Mardenfield, Worcester, Blacksmith. Pet March 20. Upton-upon-Severn, April 3 at 12. Wilson, Worcester.

Bowman, Mary, Flatgate, Howden, York, Widow. Pet March 18. Howden, April 4 at 12. Chester, Kingston-upon-Hull.

Brown, Wm, Cove, Provision Dealer. Pet March 18. Farnham, March 29 at 12. White, Guiford.

Burns, Hugh, Lpool, Wholesale Stationer. Pet March 19. Lpool, April 3 at 11. Forrest, Lpool.

Buxton, John, Sheffield, Scissor Grinder. Pet March 20. Sheffield, April 4 at 1. Binney & Son, Sheffield.

Catton, Geo, Lincoln, Builder. Pet March 19. Lincoln, April 4 at 11. Hex, Lincoln.

Chamberlain, Wm Jas, Exeter, Joiner. Pet March 19. Exeter, April 4 at 11. Flond, Exeter.

Clark, Joseph, Penrith, Cumberland, Bacon Dealer. Pet March 18. Penrith, April 3 at 10. Cant, Penrith.

Clarkson, Simon, Ilkeston, Derby, Chemist. Pet March 19. Belper, April 4 at 12. Belk, Nottingham.

Cope, John, Birn, Brass Caster. Pet March 15. Birn, April 18 at 10. Allen, Birn.

Cubber, Fredk Northamore, Prisoner for Debt, Devon. Adj March 15. Plymouth, April 1 at 12.30.

Cowdry, Wm, Bognor, Sussex, Tailor. Pet March 14. Chichester, April 3 at 11. Lamb, Brighton.

Crease, Edwd Smith, Prisoner for Debt, Devon. Adj March 15. Plymouth, April 1 at 12.30.

Dails, Robt Tomlinson, Gooe, York, Ship Broker. Pet March 19. Leeds, April 4 at 11. Wilson, Gooe.

Derry, Joseph, Chase Town, Lichfield, Stafford, Miner. Pet March 18. Lichfield, April 5 at 10. Wilson, Lichfield.

Dobson, Fras, Ramsbury, Wilts, Smith. Pet March 18. Hungerford, April 5 at 11. Goulton, Hungerford.

Dutton, Walter, Huddersfield, York, Grocer. Pet March 19. Leeds, April 1 at 11. Hesp & Co, Huddersfield.

Gaukroger, Thos, Sowbry, nr Halifax, York, Music Seller. Adj March 15. Halifax, April 12 at 10. Holroyde, Halifax.

Gleed, Philip, Jun, North Petherton, Somerset, Builder. Pet March 20. Bridgwater, April 10 at 10. Reed & Cook, Bridgwater.

Gray, Seth, Halifax, York, Comm Agent. Pet March 20. Leeds, April 11 at 11. Pullan, Leeds.

Green, Geo Churchill, Bath, Bootmaker. Pet March 18. Bath, April 3 at 12. Bartram, Bath.

Green, Squire, Hyde, Chester, Book-keeper. Pet March 19. March, April 11 at 12. Storer, Manch.

Hill, Chas, Sen, Greenhill, Glamorgan, Hay Dealer. Pet March 5. Swansea, April 3 at 2. Smith, Swansea.

Handcock, Chas, Port Tenant, Swansea, Glamorgan, Haulier. Pet March 6. Swansea, April 3 at 2. Smith, Swansea.

Harding, Wm, Birm, out of business. Pet March 16. Birm, April 18 at 10. Francis, Birm.

Jarvis, Harriet Susannah, New Brompton, Kent, Widow. Pet March 19. Rochester, April 9 at 2. Hayward, Rochester.

Jones, Morgan, Dowlais, Merthyr Tydfil, Glamorgan. Grocer. Pet March 26. Merthyr Tydfil, April 5 at 11. Rosser, Aberdare.

Jilian, Wm, Prisoner for Debt, York. Adj March 15. Gt Driffield, April 3 at 11. Mason, York.

Kettlewell, Richard, Belton, Lincoln, Farmer. Pet March 18. Thorne, April 3 at 1. Foster, Thorne.

Langley, Richard, Sheffield, Fishmonger. Pet March 20. Sheffield, April 4 at 1. Binney, Sheffield.

Lanson, Thos, Condon, Durham, Potato Merchant. Pet March 20. Newcastle-upon-Tyne, April 5 at 11.30. Hodge & Harle, Newcastle-upon-Tyne.

Lee, John, Alnwick, Northumberland, Joiner. Pet March 18. Alnwick, April 2 at 11. Smith, Alnwick.

Leech, Eliz, Portsmouth, Hants, out of business. Pet March 16. Portsmouth, April 1 at 11. White, Portes.

Mantle, Geo, Kilver, Stafford, Licensed Victualler. Pet March 19. Birm, April 3 at 12. Warrington, Dudley.

Margatrady, Hy, Albert, Shipley, York, Wine Merchant. Pet March 19. Leeds, April 1 at 11. Bond & Barwick, Leeds.

Newton, Chas, Middlesbrough, York, Innkeeper. Pet March 18. Stockton-on-Tees, April 3 at 11. Dobson, Middlesbrough.

Norgrove, Isaac, Ludlow, Salop, Innkeeper. Pet March 16. Ludlow, April 17 at 10. Wayman, Ludlow.

Pearson, Wm, West Derby-rd, nr Liverpool, Bookkeeper. Pet March 18. Liverpool, April 2 at 3. Ritson, Liverpool.

Pott, Thos, Bromley Hurst, Stafford, Cattle Dealer. Pet March 19. Uttoxeter, April 20 at 10. Wilson, Lichfield.

Rawson, Thos, Dunstan, Lincoln, Butcher. Pet March 5. Birm, April 9 at 11. Dale, Lincoln.

Ripley, David, Leeds, Cloth Finisher. Pet March 21. Leeds, April 4 at 11. Simpson, Leeds.

Robinson, Wm, Manch, Plumber. Pet March 19. Manch, April 5 at 12. Leigh, Manch.

Roebuck, Matthew, Rawmarsh, York, Coal Miner. Pet March 18. Rotherham, April 8 at 1. Roberts, Sheffield.

Rose, Danl, Kidsgrove, nr Stoke-on-Trent, Stafford, Forge Manager. Pet March 18. Birm, April 5 at 11. Green, Birm.

Royston, Wm Hy, Somersham, Huntingdon, Butcher. Pet March 15. Huntingdon, April 3 at 11.30. Coote, St Ives.

Ruddock, Thos, Normanby, York, Innkeeper. Pet March 20. Stockton-on-Tees, April 3 at 11. Griffin, Middlesbrough.

Sherin, Betsy Hutchings, & Eliza Sherin, Bridgwater, Somerset, Milliners. Pet March 18. Bridgwater, March 18 at 10. Reed & Cook, Bridgwater.

Silvester, Christopher, Manch, Beer Retailer. Pet March 19. Manch, April 2 at 11. Stringer, Manch.

Spencer, Hy, Birm, Grocer. Pet March 11. Birm, April 5 at 12. Cheshire, Birm.

Spurrier, Thos, Jun, Aston Brook, nr Birm, out of business. Pet March 7. Birm, March 29 at 10. Parry, Birm.

Thomas, Danl, Prisoner for Debt, Oxford, Adj Feb 19. Woodstock, April 8 at 10.

Thomas, Robt Widdiss, Sutton Coldfield, Warwick, Grocer. Pet Feb 29. Birm, April 3 at 12. Wilkinson, Walsall.

Thurman, Alfred, Aston New Town, nr Birm, Retail Brewer. Pet March 18. Birm, April 3 at 12. Parry, Birm.

Watkin, Wm, Stapleford, Nottingham, Journeyman Painter. Pet March 20. Nottingham, April 10 at 11. Heath, Nottingham.

Wharton, Edwin, Heckmondwike, York, Dyer. Pet March 14. Leeds, April 1 at 11. Cronkhill, Halifax.

Wilson, John, Hyde, Chester, Labourer. Pet March 19. Hyde, April 8 at 3. Drinkwater, Hyde.

Wood, John, Bourn, Lincoln, Blacksmith. Pet March 14. Bourn, April 2 at 12. Law, Stamford.

Wood, John Taylor, Bath, Somerset, Journeyman Miller. Pet March 18. Bath, April 3 at 11. Collins, Bath.

**TUESDAY, March 26, 1867.**  
To Surrender in London.

Armstrong, Alfred, Upper-st, Islington, no occupation. Pet March 19. April 11 at 2. Harrison, Basinghall-st.

Boyd, Andrew Forbes, Prisoner for Debt, London. Pet March 20 (for pau). April 10 at 2. Edwards, Bush-lane.

Clark, John, Prisoner for Debt, London. Pet March 20 (for pau). April 11 at 12. Gray, Little Tower-st.

Cooke, Archibald Anthony, Prisoner for Debt, London. Adj March 20. April 24 at 11.

Crook, Jas, Old Kent-rd, Coal Merchant. Adj March 21. April 24 at 12.

Evans, Elias, Peckham, Beershop-keeper. Pet March 18. April 11 at 1. Gray, Little Tower-st.

Harland, Wm Hy, Prisoner for Debt, Aylesbury. Adj March 15. April 10 at 1.

Hayes, Jas Hy, Minories, Coffeehouse-keeper. Pet March 23. April 15 at 12. Dobie, Basinghall-st.

Howe, Wm Hy, King-st, Long-acre, Beershop-keeper. Adj March 20. April 24 at 11.

Jones, Wm, Cheneys-mews, Bedford-st, Coachmaker. Adj March 20. April 24 at 11.

Lamb, Hy Michael, New Church-rd, Camberwell, Licensed Victualler. Adj March 21. April 24 at 12.

Levett, Chas, Gt Suffolk-st, Borough, Milkman. Adj March 21. April 24 at 12.

Maitland, Robt Forsyth, Prisoner for Debt, London. Adj March 20. April 24 at 11.

Manning, Geo, Medbury, Bedford, out of business. Pet March 22. April 17 at 12. Shum & Crossman, King's-rd, Bedford-row.

Marshall, Fredk Carver, Norwood, Licensed Victualler. Pet March 19 April 17 at 12. Michael, Barge-yd.

Martelly, Mathew, Prisoner for Debt, London. Adj March 20. April 24 at 11.

Neale, Geo, Geo-st, Camberwell, Bricklayer. Pet March 19. April 10 at 1. Dobie, Basinghall-st.

Peat, Geo, Prisoner for Debt, London. Adj March 20. April 24 at 11.

Pedigrif, Chas, Kennington-st, Walworth, Plasterer. Pet March 20. April 11 at 2. Hicklin, Trinity-sq, Borough.

Philpot, Thos Gurney, Prisoner for Debt, Maidstone. Adj March 20. April 24 at 12.

Pout, Geo, Prisoner for Debt, London. Pet March 22 (for pau). April 17 at 12. Edwards, Bush-lane.

Redfern, Thos Chas, St Paul's-ct, New North-rd, Chronometer Finisher. Pet March 22. April 15 at 12. Ricketts, Frederic-st, Gray's-inn-rd.

Reichfeld, Joseph, Cress-ct, Bow-st, Covert-garden, Tailor. Pet March 21. April 17 at 11. Padmore, Westminster-bridge-rd.

Russel, John Howard, Hawley, Kent, Comm Agent. Pet March 23. April 15 at 12. Russell & Co, Old Jewry-chambers.

Sheppard, Wm, Prisoner for Debt, London. Adj March 20. April 24 at 12.

Sheard, Thos, Prisoner for Debt, London. Adj March 20. April 24 at 12.

Shepperd, John, Prisoner for Debt, London. Pet March 20 (for pau). April 11 at 11. Edwards, Bush-lane.

Smith, Saml Cater, Prisoner for Debt, Ipswich. Adj March 15. April 16 at 1.

Solomon, John Joseph, Lower Thames-st, Merchant. Pet March 20. April 11 at 1. Murray, St St Helen's.

Stephenson, Walter, Bate's-ter, Wardsworth-rd, Salesman. Pet March 19. April 10 at 1. Long, Pitfield-st, Hoxton.

Warne, Chas, Syleham, Suffolk, Linen Manufacturer. Pet March 21. April 10 at 2. Downing, Basinghall-st.

Webb, Richd Fras, Cooper's-row, Crutched Friars, Wine Merchant. Pet March 19. April 10 at 1. Hilbery, Crutched Friars.

Wilcockson, Herbert, Goodge-st, Embroiderer. Pet March 22. April 15 at 12. Norton, Clifford's-inn.

To Surrender in the Country.

Aldred, Saml, Bedford, Lancaster, Bleacher. Pet March 23. Leigh, April 10 at 1. Ramwell, Bolton.

Andrew, Frank, Mossley, York, Cotton Spinner. Pet March 13. Manch, April 9 at 11. Potter & Knight, Manch.

Andrew, William, Mossley, York, Cotton Spinner. Pet March 21. Manch April 18 at 12. Gardner, Manch.

Beddows, Hy, Little Lever, Lancaster, Wheelwright. Pet March 22. Bolton, April 10 at 10. Edge & Co, Bolton.

Black, Abraham, jun, Walcot-by-Timberland, Lincoln, Butcher. Pet March 20. Sleaford, April 8 at 10. Rex, Lincoln.

Blyth, Joshua, sen, Norwib, Bakers. Pet March 22. Norwich, April 11 at 11. Sad, Norwich.

Bosworth, John, Lpool, Book-keeper. Pet March 23. Lpool, April 8 at 11. Ety, Lpool.

Bretmell, Francis, Burton-on-Trent, Stafford, Beerhouse Keeper. Pet March 20. Burton-on-Trent, April 10 at 1. Wilson, Burton.

Brey, Elizabeth, Leeds, Glass and China Dealer. Pet March 21. Leeds, April 8 at 11. Cariss and Tempest, Leeds.

Brion, Chas, Brighton, Lodging-hous, Keeper. Pet March 23. Brighton, April 10 at 11. Runcunes, Brighton.

Brockman, David, Dover, Kent, Labourer. Pet March 23. Dover, April 10 at 12. Minton, Dover.

Broome, Edward, Prisoner for debt, Leicester. April 9 at 11. Maples, Nottingham.

Carburt, William, Birkenhead, Chester, Stationer. Pet March 21. Birkenhead, April 10 at 10. Anderson, Birkenhead.

Cheswick, Joseph, Scotton, Horsebreaker. Adj March 9. Gainsborough, April 2 at 10.

Crisp, Isaac, Framlingham, Suffolk, Innkeeper. Pet March 21. Framlingham, April 8 at 11. Shafte, Framlingham.

Deakin, Edwin Jas, Prisoner for Debt, Worcester. Adj March 13. Worcester, April 8 at 11. Wilson, Worcester.

Denkin, Wm, Wednesbury, Stafford, out of business. Pet March 15. Walsall, April 6 at 12. Duigan & Co, Walsall.

Evans, John Tasker, Stafford, Corn Factor. Pet March 11. Birm, April 10 at 12. Hand, Stafford.

Farrell, Michael, Salford, Lancaster, Provision Dealer. Pet March 22. Salford, April 6 at 9.30. Mann, Manch.

Firth, Josiah, Prisoner for Debt, Halifax. Pet March 22. Dewsbury, April 5 at 3. Ibberson, Dewsbury.

Fogg, Jas, Liscard, Chester, Cart Owner. Pet March 23. Birkenhead, April 10 at 10. Anderson, Birkenhead.

Forrest, Joseph, Bradley, Worcester, Horse Nail Maker. Pet March 11. Stourbridge, April 7 at 10. Stokes, Dudley.

Freer, Stephen, Kethley, Leicester, Grocer. Pet March 21. Leicester, April 13 at 10. Harvey, Leicester.

Gibbs, Geo Pile, Ilfracombe, Devon, Builder. Pet March 21. Exeter, April 5 at 11.30. Fryer, Exeter.

Harrison, Chas Edwd, Manch. Pet March 23. Manch, April 10 at 12. Stone, Manch.

Harvey, John, Prisoner for Debt, Gloucester. Adj March 19. Bristol, April 6 at 11.

Hodgkinson, Thos, Wolstanton, Stafford, Crate Maker. Pet March 16. Newcastle-under-Lyme, April 9 at 11. Salt, Tunstall.

Howarth, Jas, Prisoner for Debt, Manch. Adj March 19. Manch, April 6 at 9.30. Nuttall, Manch.

Ison, Joseph, Ashby-de-la-Zouch, Leicester, Butcher. Pet March 21. Ashby-de-la-Zouch, April 4 at 11. Dewes, Ashby-de-la-Zouch.

Knight, Jas Wasley, Falmouth, Cornwall, Mercer. Pet March 23. Falmouth, April 5 at 11. Jenkins, Penryn.

Latch, Hy, Newport, Monmouth, Clerk. Pet March 21. Bristol, April 5 at 11. Batchelor, Newport.

Latch, John, Cardiff, Glamorgan, Underwriter. Pet March 21. Bristol, April 5 at 11. Batchelor, Newport.

Lewis, Thos, Templeton, Pembrokeshire, Publican. Pet March 19. Narberth, April 5 at 11. Lascells, Narberth.

Lowe, Chas, Delph, within Saddleworth, York, Grocer. Pet March 6. Manch, April 6 at 11. Redfern & Son, Oldham.

Mawhood, Richd, Exeter, Merchant. Pet March 20. Exeter, April 5 at 12. Willesford, Exeter.

Newborn, Richd, Cherry Willingham, Lincoln, Grocer. Pet March 22. Lincoln, April 10 at 11. Rex, Lincoln.

O'Brien, Michael, Lpool, Boot Maker. Pet March 21. Lpool, April 9 at 3. Grocott, Lpool.

Pace, Wm, St Blazey, Cornwall, Surgeon. Pet March 22. St Austell, April 5 at 12.30. Wreford, Fowey.

Pierce, Abraham, Preston, Lancaster. Pet March 21. Preston, April 6 at 12. Blackhurst, Preston.

Pointon, Hy, Ashby-de-la-Zouch, Leicester, Butcher. Pet March 21. Ashby-de-la-Zouch, April 4 at 11. Dewes, Ashby-de-la-Zouch.

Pool, Wm, jun, Kingstone-upon-Hull, Coal Merchant. Pet March 20. Leeds, April 10 at 12. Bell & Hull, Leeds.

Richardson, John, Dunston, Lincoln, Farmer. Pet March 23. Lincoln, April 10 at 11. Brown & Son, Lincoln.

Ridde, Wm, Middlesbrough, York, Grocer. Pet March 21. Leeds, April 8 at 11. Simpson, Leeds.

Roper, Hy, Pendleton, Manch, Paper Hanging Manufacturer. Pet March 23. Manch, April 10 at 12. Leigh, Manch.

Rushton, John, Birm, Cab Driver. Pet March 23. Birm, April 18 at 10. Williams, Birm.

Simmonds, William, Brighton, Sussex, Fruiterer. Pet March 21. Brighton, April 9 at 11. Lamb, Brighton.

Stokes, John, Birm, Gun Maker. Adj March 16. Birm, April 18 at 10. Thompson, John, Bolton, South Shields, Durham, Grocer. Pet March 21. Newcastle-upon-Tyne, April 10 at 12.30. Robinson, Sunderland Tremelien, Jas Wm, Merchant-Tydfil, Glamorgan, Leather Seller. Pet March 23. Bristol, April 6 at 11. Osborne & Co, Bristol.

Tucker, Thos, Bideford, Devon, Tailor. Pet March 20. Bideford, April 8 at 2. Smale, Bideford.

Tyler, John Hy, & Thos Savage Tyler, Jun, Lpool, Wine & Spirit Merchants. Pet March 23. Lpool, April 9 at 11. Husband, Lpool.

Vicars, Thos Wm, Derby, Grocer. Pet March 22. Birm, April 9 at 11. Briggs, Derby.

Vewles, Joseph Saml, Bristol, out of business. Pet March 22. Bristol, April 10 at 12. Parker.

Wales, Lewis, Broadstairs, Kent, Grocer. Pet March 23. Margate, April 8 at 11. Gibson, Margate.

Walker, John, Swineshead, Lincoln, Blacksmith. Pet March 21. Boston, April 3 at 10. Bean, Boston.

Webster, Wm, Everton, Lancaster, out of business. Pet March 21. Birkenhead, April 10 at 10. Anderson, Birkenhead.

Wise, John, Coseley, Stafford, Sheet Iron Worker. Pet Feb 14. Dudley, April 6 at 12. Lowe, Dudley.

## BANKRUPTCIES ANNULLED.

FRIDAY, March 22, 1867.

Crutwell, Frede Robt, Limpley Stoke, Wilts, Attorney-at-Law. March 12.

Justice, Philip Wm, Presbury, nr Cheltenham, Gloucester, Gent. Feb 27.

Tweedale, Sarah, Rochdale, Lancaster, out of business. March 18.

TUESDAY, March 26, 1867.

Tomalin, Benj, Sandgate, Kent, Tailor. March 23.

Little, Hy Bowman, Baker's-buildings, Liverpool-st, Builder. March 26.

GRESHAM LIFE ASSURANCE SOCIETY,  
37, OLD JEWRY, LONDON, E.C.

SOLICITORS are invited to introduce, on behalf of their clients, Proposals for Loans on Freehold or Leasehold Property, Reversions, Life Interests, or other adequate securities.

Proposals may be made in the first instance according to the following form:-

## PROPOSAL FOR LOAN ON MORTGAGES.

Date.....

Introduced by (state name and address of solicitor)

Amount required £

Time and mode of repayment (i. e., whether for a term certain, or by annual or other payments)

Security (state shortly the particulars of security, and, if land or buildings, state the net annual income)

State what Life Policy (if any) is proposed to be effected with the Gresham Office in connexion with the security.

By order of the Board,

F. ALLAN CURTIS, Actuary and Secretary.

PHILLIPS & COMPANY'S TEAS ARE BEST  
AND CHEAPEST. STRONG TO FINE BLACK TEA, 1s. 6d., 2s. 2s. 6d., 3s. 3s. 4s. 4d. Most Delicious Black Tea is now only 2s. 6d. per pound. Pure, Rich, Rare, Choice Coffee, 1s. 4d., 1s. 6d., 1s. 8d. PHILLIPS & CO., Tea Merchants, 8, King William-street, City, London, E.C.

A price current free. Sugars at market prices.

PHILLIPS & CO. send all goods Carried Free within eight miles of No. 8, King William-street; 40s. worth Carriage Free to any Railway Station or Market Town in England. Phillips & Co. have no agents, nor any connexion with any house in Worcester or Swaines.

SLACK'S SILVER ELECTRO PLATE is a coating of pure Silver over Nickel. A combination of two metals possessing such valuable properties renders it in appearance and wear equal to Sterling Silver.

	Fiddle Pattern.	Thread.	King's.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.
Table Forks, per doz.....	1 10 0	1 18 0	2 8 0	3 0 0			
Dessert ditto .....	1 0 0	1 10 0	1 15 0	2 2 0			
Table Spoons .....	1 10 0	1 18 0	2 8 0	3 0 0			
Dessert ditto .....	1 0 0	1 10 0	1 15 0	2 2 0			
Tea Spoons .....	0 12 0	0 18 0	1 3 6	1 0 0			

Every Article for the Table as in Silver. A Sample Tea Spoon forwarded on receipt of 20 stamps.

RICHARD &amp; JOHN SLACK, 336, STRAND, LONDON.

Just published, Second Edition, price 3s. THE LAW OF TRADE MARKS, with some account of its History and Development in the Decisions of the Courts of Law and Equity. By EDWARD LLOYD, Esq., of Lincoln's Inn, Barrister-at-Law, London.

"I am indebted to the very valuable little publication of Mr. Lloyd who has collected all the authorities on this subject."—V. C. Wood, in *McAndrew v. Bassett*, March 4.

London: 59, Carey-street, Lincoln's-inn, W.C.

## WHAT IS YOUR CREST AND MOTTO?

Send name and county to Culleton's Heraldic Office, with 3s. 6d. for plain sketch; in heraldic colours, 6s. The arms of man and wife blended. The proper colours for servants' livery. Family pedigrees traced. Culleton's book of family crests and mottoes, 4,000 engravings, printed in colour £10 10s. The Manual of Heraldry, 400 engravings, 3s. 6d.; crest engraved on seals, rings, and dies, 7s. 6d.; book plate engraved with arms, 21s.—T. CULLETON, Genealogist, 25, Cranbourne-street, corner of St. Martin's-lane.

## CULLETON'S EMBOSSED PRESSES, 21s., for Stamping Paper with Crest, Monogram, or Address. Anyone can use them.—25, Cranbourne-street.

## BOOK-PLATES Engraved with Arms and Crest, 21s. Liverby-butter Dies, 2 g. Crest on silver spoons or forks, 5s. per dozen; Crest on seals or steel dies, 7s. 6d. Desk Seals with engraved crest or monogram, 12s.—T. CULLETON, 25, Cranbourne-street.

## 5 QUIRE OF PAPER, 3s., Stamped with Monogram; 100 Envelopes, 1s. 6d. No charge for engraving Steel Die with Monogram, Crest, or Address, if an order be given for a Ream of very best paper and 500 Envelopes, all Stamped, for 21s., or P.O. order. Monograms designed, 1s.—25, Cranbourne-street.

## CULLETON'S VISITING CARD.—A copper-plate engraved and 50 superfine Cards printed for 2s.; post-free, 2s. 3d.—25, Cranbourne-street.

## CULLETON'S PLATES for MARKING LINEN.

The most permanent way of marking Linen with Crest, Monogram, or Name. Anyone can use them. Initial Plate, 1s.; Name Plate, 2s. 6d.; Set of Moveable Numbers, 2s. 6d.; Crest, 5s.; with directions, post-free for cash or stamps. By T. CULLETON, Seal Engraver to her Majesty and Diesinker to the Board of Trade, 25, Cranbourne-street (corner of St. Martin's-lane), W.C.

## THE SMOKER'S BONBON effectually removes the Taste and Smell of Tobacco from the Mouth and Breath, and renders Smoking agreeable and safe. It is very pleasant and wholesome. Prepared by patent process, from the recipe of an eminent physician, by SCHOOLING &amp; CO., Wholesale Confectioners, Bethnal-green, London, in Sixpenny and Shilling boxes; post free, 7 and 14 stamps.—Sold by Chemists, Tobacconists, &amp;c.

## SLACK'S FENDER AND FIRE-IRON WARE-HOUSE is the MOST ECONOMICAL, consistent with good quality.—Iron Fenders, 3s. 6d.; Bronze ditto, 8s. 6d., with standards; superior Drawing-room ditto, 14s. 6d. to 50s.; Fire Irons, 2s. 6d. to 20s. Patent Dish Covers, with handles to take off, 18s. set of six. Table Knives and Forks, 8s. per dozen. Roasting Jacks, complete, 7s. 6d. Tea-trays, 1s. 6d. set of three; elegant Papier Mache ditto, 35s. the set. Teapots, with plated knob, 5s. 6d.; Coal Scuttles, 2s. 6d. A set of Kitchen Utensils for cottage, £2. Slack's Cutlery has been colourised for 50 years. Ivory Table Knives, 14s., 16s., and 18s. per dozen. White Bone Knives and Forks, 8s. 9d. and 12s.; Black Horn ditto, 8s. and 10s. All warranted.

As the limits of an advertisement will not allow of a detailed list, pur-chasers are requested to send for their Catalogue, with 350 drawings, and prices of Electro-Plate, Warranted Table Cutlery, Furnishing Ironmongery, &c. May be had gratis or post free. Every article marked in plain figures at the same low prices for which their establishment has been celebrated for nearly 50 years. Orders above £2 delivered carriage free per rail.

RICHARD & JOHN SLACK, 336, STRAND, LONDON,  
Opposite Somerset House.YATES AND ALEXANDER,  
PRINTERS,

7, 8, 9, Church Passage, Chancery Lane, E.C.

Parliamentary Bills, Appeals, Bills of Complaint, Memorandums and Articles of Association, Legal Forms, Notices, &c.

Prospectuses of Public Companies, Share Certificates, Show Cards, Cheques, Insurance Tables, Policies, Proposal Forms.

Catalogues, Particulars and Conditions of Sale, Posting Bills, and all General Printing.

BILLS OF COMPLAINT AND ANSWERS,  
FOR CASH, 4s. 6d. PER PAGE,

A Lower Charge than has hitherto been offered by the Trade.

PRICE IF PUT TO ACCOUNT,	10 Copies.	30 Copies.	30 Copies.	30 Copies.
8 pages.....	£2 2s. 6d.	£2 3s. 6d.	£2 4s. 6d.	£2 6s. 6d.

YATES & ALEXANDER,  
LAW, PARLIAMENTARY, AND GENERAL PRINTERS,

7, 8, 9, Church Passage, Chancery Lane, E.C.

**O**RIENTAL BANK CORPORATION.  
Incorporated by Royal Charter, 30th August, 1851. Paid-up Capital £1,500,000; Reserved Fund, £411,000.

## COURT OF DIRECTORS.

CHAIRMAN—HARRY GEORGE GORDON, Esq.

DEPUTY-CHAIRMAN—WILLIAM SCOTT BINNEY, Esq.

James Blyth, Esq.  
Duncan James Kay, Esq.  
Alexander Mackenzie, Esq.

Charles J. F. Stuart, Esq., Chief Manager.

## BANKERS.

The Bank of England; The Union Bank of London.

The Corporation grant drafts and negotiate or collect bills payable at Bombay, Calcutta, Madras, Pondicherry, Ceylon, Hong Kong, Shanghai, Yokohama, Singapore, Mauritius, Melbourne, and Sydney, on terms which may be ascertained at their office. They also issue circular notes for the use of travellers by the Overland Route.

They undertake the agency of parties connected with India, the purchase and sale of Indian securities, the safe custody of Indian Government paper, the receipt of interest, dividends, pay, pensions, &c., and the effecting of remittances between the above-named dependencies.

They also receive deposits of £100 and upwards, repayable at ten days' notice, and also for longer periods, the terms for which may be ascertained on application at their office.

Office hours, 10 to 3; Saturdays, 10 to 2.

Threadneedle-street, London, 1867.

**T**HE AGRa BANK (LIMITEd).  
Established in 1833.—Capital, £1,000,000.

HEAD OFFICE—NICHOLAS-LANE, LOMBARD-STREET, LONDON.

## BANKERS.

Messrs. GLYN, MILLS, CURRIE, & Co., and BANK OF ENGLAND.  
BRANCHES in Edinburgh, Calcutta, Bombay, Madras, Kurrachee, Agra, Lahore, Shanghai, Hong Kong.

CURRENT ACCOUNTS are kept at the Head Office on the terms customary with London bankers, and interest allowed when the credit balance does not fall below £100.

DEPOSITS received for fixed periods on the following terms, viz.:—  
At 5 per cent. per annum, subject to 12 months' notice of withdrawal.  
At 4 ditto ditto 6 ditto ditto ditto.  
At 3 ditto ditto 3 ditto ditto ditto.

EXCEPTIONAL RATES for longer periods than twelve months, particulars of which may be obtained on application.

BILLS issued at the current exchange of the day on any of the Branches of the Bank free of extra charge; and approved bills purchased or sent for collection.

SALES AND PURCHASES effected in British and foreign securities, in East India stock and loans, and the safe custody of the same undertaken.

Interest drawn, and army, navy, and civil pay and pensions realised.

Every other description of banking business and money agency, British and Indian, transacted.

M. BALFOUR, Manager.

**L**AW FIRE INSURANCE SOCIETY. Offices, Chancery-lane, London. Subscribed Capital, £5,000,000.

## TRUSTEES.

The Right Hon. the Lord High Chancellor.

The Right Hon. Lord Truro.

The Right Hon. Sir Frederick Pollock, Bart.

The Right Hon. the Lord Justice Sir G. J. Turner.

The Right Hon. John Robert Mowbray, M.P., Judge Advocate-General.

William Brougham, Esq.

Insurances expiring at Lady-day should be renewed within 15 days thereafter, at the offices of the Society, or with any of its agents throughout the country. The full and immediate benefit of the reduction of duty to £s. 6d. per cent. will be given to the insured.

EDWARD BLAKE BEAL, Secretary.

**T**HE GUARDIAN FIRE AND LIFE ASSUR-  
ANCE COMPANY.

ESTABLISHED 1821.

No. 11, LOMBARD STREET, LONDON, E.C.

Reduction of Fire Insurance Duty.

SUBSCRIBED CAPITAL TWO MILLION.

Total Invested Funds upwards of £2,750,000.

Total Income upwards of £320,000.

Notice is hereby given that FIRE POLICIES, which expire at Lady-day, must be renewed within Fifteen Days at this Office, or with the Company's Agents throughout the Kingdom, otherwise they become void.

All Insurances now have the benefit of the Reduced Duty of £s. 6d. per Cent.

For Prospectus and other information apply to the Company's Agents; or to T. TELLEMACH, Secretary.

**T**HE NATIONAL REVERSIONARY INVEST-  
MENT COMPANY (instituted 1837), for the Purchase of Absolute  
or Contingent Reversions, Life Interests, and Policies of Assurance on  
Lives.

Office—No. 63, Old Broad-street, London, E.C.

JOHN PEMBERTON HEYWOOD, Esq., Chairman.

EDWIN WARD SCADDING, Esq., Deputy-Chairman.

Solicitors—Messrs. Iliffe, Russell, and Iliffe, Bedford row.

Actuary—Robert Tucker, Esq., the Pelican Life Assurance Company.

Forms for submitting proposals for sale may be obtained at the office\* of the company.

G. A. RENDALL, Secretary.

## ANNUITIES AND REVERSIONS.

**L**AW REVERSIONARY INTEREST SOCIETY,  
68, Chancery-lane London.

CHAIRMAN—The Right Hon. Russell Gurney, Q.C., M.P., Recorder of London.

DEPUTY-CHAIRMAN—Sir W. J. Alexander, Bart., Q.C.

Reversions and Life Interests purchased. Immediate and Deferred Annuities granted in exchange for Reversionary and Contingent Interests.

Loans may also be obtained on the security of Reversions.

Annuities, Immediate, Deferred, and Contingent, and also Endowments granted on favourable terms.

Prospectuses and Forms of Proposal, and all further information, may be had at the office.

C. B. CLABON, Sec.

**T**HE GENERAL REVERSIONARY AND IN-  
VESTMENT COMPANY, Office, 5, Whitehall, London, S.W.  
Established 1826. Further empowered by special Act of Parliament,  
14 and 15 Vict., cap. 139. Capital £500,000.

The business of this Company consists in the purchase of, or loans upon, reversionary interests, vested or contingent, in landed or funded property, or securities; also life interests in possession, as well as in expectation; and policies of assurance upon lives.

Prospectuses and forms of proposals may be obtained from the Secretary, to whom all communications should be addressed.

WM. BARWICK HODGE, Actuary and Secretary.

**A**CCIDENTS WILL HAPPEN,  
Everyone should therefore provide against them!

**£1000 IN CASE OF DEATH, OR £6 PER WEEK WHILE LAID UP BY INJURY  
CAUSED BY**

## ACCIDENT OF ANY KIND,

May be secured by an Annual Payment of from £3 to £6 5s. to the RAILWAY PASSENGERS' ASSURANCE COMPANY

The oldest established Company in the World insuring against

## ACCIDENTS OF EVERY DESCRIPTION.

64, COENHILL, AND 10, REGENT STREET, LONDON.

WILLIAM J. VIAN, Secretary.

**T**HE IMPERIAL LAND COMPANY OF MAR-  
SEILLES (LIMITEd).—Debentures.—Notice is hereby given, that the Interest Warrants No. 2 falling due on the 31st instant, must be sent into this office for examination two days prior to payment. After the same are duly stamped, they will be payable on presentation at the National Bank, 13, Old Broad street, London.

By order of the Board,

No. 10, St. Swithin's-lane, London, E.C., March 27, 1867.

CHARLES FRASER, Secretary.

**T**HE GENERAL LAND DRAINAGE and IM-  
PROVEMENT COMPANY.

Works of Drainage of any extent, Irrigation, Enclosing, Wood Grubbing, Roadmaking, Farm Houses, Farm Buildings, and Labourers' Cottages, are executed on all descriptions of property, whether freehold, entailed, mortgaged, trust, ecclesiastical, corporate, or collegiate, or loans granted for the purpose to landowners who desire to execute the works by their own agents and with their own plans.

The whole of the outlay in the works, with all official expenses, may be charged on the estate for a term of years to be fixed by the landowners, to meet the circumstances of tenants.

No investigation of title being required, no legal expenses are incurred.

Applications to be made to Mr. Horace Broke, the Secretary, at the offices of the Company, 22, Whitehall-place, London, S.W.

**TWENTY THOUSAND POUNDS to be advanced**  
on application, in sums of £100 and upwards by the

**PLANET PERMANENT BUILDING AND INVESTMENT SOCIETY.**

Upon mortgage of House Property situate in any part of the

United Kingdom.

Monthly Repayments, including principal and interest, for each £100 advanced (less a small premium):—

6 years.	8 years.	10 years.	12 years.	14 years.
£ s. d. 1 13 2	£ s. d. 1 6 2	£ s. d. 1 1 10	£ s. d. 0 19 3	£ s. d. 0 17 0

Redemption at any time by payment of balance of principal due.

Established by Act of Parliament nineteen years.

Annual business exceeds £300,000.

EDMUND W. RICHARDSON, Secretary.

Offices, 39, City-road, London.

**UNIVERSITY LIFE ASSURANCE SOCIETY.**

—Extension to Foundation Schools.—Additions in 1865 at the rate of 12 per cent. per annum.

CHARLES McCABE, Sec.

24, Suffolk-street, London, S.W.

**B**ROOKS & SCHALLER (removed from Piccadilly)

—The INDEX, printed MONTHLY (first published in 1820), of ESTATES, Country and Town Houses, Manors, Hunting Quarters, Shootings and Fishings, Farms, &c., to be LET or SOLD, can be had (free) at their Offices, 23, Charles-street, St. James's, S.W., opposite the Junior United Service Club. Particulars inserted without charge, but for next publication must be forwarded before the 23rd of each month.

